



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A. F. Pollard

May 1892.

Jesus College

Oxford



HISTORY OF ENGLAND

IN THE

XVIIITH CENTURY

VOL. II.

ISAAC FOOT
LIBRARY

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

A

HISTORY OF ENGLAND

IN THE

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

BY

WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY

2

NEW EDITION

VOLUME II.

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1892

All rights reserved

DA
480
L4
1892
V.2

CONTENTS

OF

THE SECOND VOLUME.

CHAPTER IV.

	PAGE
The new Ministry	1
Convention of the Austrians with Frederick	2
Austrian victories in Bohemia and Bavaria	3
Charles VII. crowned Emperor	3
Frederick breaks the Convention. Battle of Czaslau	4
Peace of Breslau	4
Expulsion of the French from Bohemia	5
Death of Fleury	6
Rapid changes of fortune in Italy	6
Services of the British fleet	7
The Austrians completely victorious in Germany	8
The Dutch enter the war	8
Battle of Dettingen	9
Revelsion of feeling in England. Ambitious views of Maria Theresa	9
Exaggerated war measures of England	10
Alleged subordination of English to Hanoverian interests	12
Unpopularity of Carteret	15
Death of Lord Wilmington. Ascendency of the Pelhams	16
Henry Pelham	16
Abortive attempt of the French to invade England	18
French and Spanish fleet escapes from Toulon in spite of the English	18
Brilliant campaign of the French in Flanders	19
Interrupted by the Austrian invasion of Alsace	20

	PAGE
Frederick renews the war	21
Capture of Prague with its garrison	22
The Emperor reinstated in Munich	22
Frederick driven into Silesia	23
French capture Friburg	23
Italian campaigns in 1744	23
1745. Offensive alliance between England, Holland, Austria, and Saxony	24
Death of Charles VII.	25
Peace between Austria and Bavaria. The Duke of Lorraine elected Emperor	25
Victories of the Prussians. Peace of Dresden between Austria and Prussia	26
Insurrection of Genoa. French and Spaniards victorious in Italy	26
French campaign in Flanders. Battle of Fontenoy and its results	27
The Jacobite insurrection of 1745	28
General incapacity of the British commanders	28
Successes of the navy	31
Italian campaigns of 1746	32
Victories of the French in Flanders and Holland	32
Failure of the attempt of the King to displace Pelham	34
Re-establishment of the Ministry	34
Condition of Europe called urgently for peace	35
Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle	37
Reduction of the army	40
Foundation of Halifax	41
Financial measures of Pelham	41
Great predominance of the commercial spirit in Parliament	44
Anxiety for Parliamentary reform in the country	45

Parliamentary Corruption and Tyranny

Simultaneous growth of the power of the Commons and the influence of Government upon its members since the Revolution	45
Arbitrary proceedings of the Lower House. The Kentish petitioners	47
The Aylesbury election	49
Parliamentary censorship of the Press	50
Parliamentary privilege	51
Scandalous proceedings in the trials of disputed elections	52
Parliamentary reporting forbidden. Its history	55
Measure against bribery	61
Measures diminishing the number of pensioners and place-holders in Parliament	61

	PAGE
Attempts to shorten the duration of Parliament. Effects of the Septennial Act	63

Redeeming Features of Parliament

Character of the English upper classes	66
Constant infusion of young members	66
The representation of the counties and of the large towns	67
Fear of the Pretender	68
Attention paid to popular wishes	69
Comparative simplicity of English politics	69
Low standard of political honour	70
Exclusive employment of Government patronage for political ends	71
Danger of leaving science and literature to the unrestricted operation of the law of supply and demand	72
Methods that have been adopted for encouraging them	76
Government patronage of literature under Anne	79
Effects of the degradation of literature under the first Georges	81
Patronage of Queen Caroline	83
Decline of political enthusiasm	85
Attitude of the nation in 1745	88
Browne's 'Estimate'	89
Superiority of the English Government to most Continental ones	91
Confusion of party qualities	93
National history of Whigs and Tories	94
Reforms in Scotland	97

Legislation about Public Order

On gin-drinking. History of Drunkenness	97
Extreme danger of London streets. The Mohocks	105
The inefficiency of the watchmen	106
Street robberies	107
Abolition of the privileges of the Mint	109
Measures for the better lighting of London	110
Formation of a new police force	111
Frequency of riots	113
Wrecking. Laws to repress it	113

The Marriage Act of Lord Hardwicke

Clandestine marriages	115
English legislation on marriage	117
Difference between the secular and the theological aspects of marriage	118

	PAGE
Divorce	119
Growth of the secular view of marriage in English law	124
Success of Lord Hardwicke's Act	125
Decline of the spirit of philanthropy and reform	126
Berkeley	126
Oglethorpe	127
Condition of debtors' prisons	128
Foundation of Georgia	131
Neglected condition of the navy and army	133
Atrocious penal system	134
The nation assuming rapidly its modern aspect	137
 <i>Growth of the Modern Military System</i>	
Improvements in the art of war led to standing armies	140
History of the Mutiny Act	140
Opinion of Blackstone	143
Jealousy of the Army	144
History of barracks	146

CHAPTER V.

National Tastes and Manners

Growth of newspapers and magazines	151
Coarseness of manners	153
Gambling	155
Gardening	158
Architecture	161
Painting	161
Music. Growth of the Opera.	168
Career of Handel	169
The Drama. Its immorality.	177
Legislation on the subject	181
'The Beggars' Opera'	182
Depression of taste	183
The Shakespearean revival	184
Garrick	185
Puritanical opposition to the theatre	189
Amusements with animals.	192
Watering-places	198
Rise of sea-bathing	199
Character of country life	200
Condition of the poor.	203
Increase of London	211

	PAGE
Town amusements	216
Fashionable hours	217
Domestic service.	218
Sanitary condition of London	221
Growth of medicine	223
Anatomy	223
Inoculation.	224
Conclusion	226

CHAPTER VI.

THE COLONIES AND SCOTLAND.

The Colonies

Favourable circumstances of those in America	229
Their early difficulties	231
Invasion of charters under the Stuarts	232
Effect of the Revolution on the Colonies	232
Forms of government	233
Rivalry with Spain, Holland, and France	235
Commercial policy of the mother country	237
Effects of the commercial laws in producing disaffection	241
Introduction of criminals into America	242
Introduction of slavery. First English slave-hunters	242
Growth of the institution after the Peace of Utrecht	243
Relations of the Home Government to slavery	246
Illustrations of public opinion on the subject	247
Causes which drove American slavery southwards	249
Puritanical customs	249
The theatre	250
Inoculation	250
Intellectual progress	251
Other colonies of England	252

Scotland

Condition of the Highlands at the beginning of the eighteenth century	255
Highland superstitions	263
Illustrations of Highland fidelity	265
Other Highland virtues	269
Inverness	271
Aberdeen	272
Educational establishments	272
The Lowlands. Edinburgh	274
Miserable state of the Lowlands	277

	PAGE
Religious persecution	277
Commercial disabilities	278
Great poverty and disorder throughout Scotland	278
Proposals of Fletcher of Saltoun	279

Remedial Measures

<i>Ecclesiastical.</i> Establishment of the Kirk	280
The parish schools	282
Condition of education in Scotland	283
The Act of Toleration	286
Discontent of the Presbyterians	289
<i>Industrial.</i> The Union : its commercial clauses	292
Measures of the Scotch tending to independence	293
Difficulties in carrying the Union	296
Great commercial prosperity following it	300
Comparison between the Scotch and Irish Unions	302
Prolonged hostility to the Union in Scotiand	306

Improvement of the Highlands

Decrease of the Gaelic tongue under the influence of the parish schools	310
The Highland roads	311
Causes lowering the position of the Highland chiefs	312
Abolition of hereditary jurisdiction	312
Abolition of the national dress	313
Severe measures against the Episcopalians	313
The Highland regiments	315
Transition from the feudal to the commercial conception of landlords	315
Improvement in agriculture	318
Decline of mendicancy	319
How far legislation can civilise nations	320
Scotland in the middle of the eighteenth century still in many ways behind England	322
Torture. Serfdom. Judicial and political corruption	323
Character of Scotch politicians	324
Character of Scotch religion	327
Narrowness and intolerance	329
Witchcraft	330
Ascetic tendencies	334
Gradual change of manners and belief	336
Scotch virtues partly due to industrial habits	342
Effects of the Highlands on Scotch character	343

CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE
Death of Pelham leads to the ascendancy of the Duke of Newcastle	345
His character	345
Competition for the leadership of the House of Commons .	347
Murray—Fox—Pitt	347
Appointment of Sir Thomas Robinson	350
Conduct of Pitt and Fox	350
Reconciliation of Fox and Newcastle	351
Hostilities break out between the French and English in America	352
General distrust of Newcastle	353
Recall of the French ambassador. English aggressions in America	355
Seizure of French ships	356
German subsidies	357
Opposed by Pitt	357
Dismissal of Pitt	358
Changes in the Ministry. Treaty with Prussia	358
Alliance between Austria, Russia, and Saxony	359
Acceded to by France	360
Frederick discovers the plot against him	362
Great panic in England. Fears of invasion	362
French expedition against Minorca	363
Conduct of Byng. Minorca taken by the French	364
Disasters in America	365
Progress of the French in India. Policy of Dupleix	366
English triumph in the Carnatic	367
Surajah Dowlah captures Calcutta	367
Frederick takes Dresden	368
Battle of Lobositz. Capitulation of Saxon Army	368
Resignation of Fox	369
And of Newcastle	369
Fox fails in attempting to form a Ministry	369
Ministry of Devonshire and Pitt	370
Weakness of the Ministry. Hostility of the King	371
Execution of Byng	372
Dismissal of Temple and Pitt. Popularity of Pitt	375
Interregnum	375
Formation of the Coalition Ministry of Newcastle and Pitt	376
Condition of parties in England	377
Antipathy of the King to Pitt	379
Their reconciliation	380

William Pitt

PAGE

Character of his eloquence	381
Effect of reporting on Parliamentary eloquence	388
Nobility of the character of Pitt	389
His general sympathy with the popular sentiment	390
His courage in opposing it	391
His inconsistencies. Retrospect of his career	392
Ingratitude to Newcastle	399
His arrogance	400
His theatrical character	401
His attitude to royalty	402
The ostentation of his virtues	404
His war policy. Disasters that preceded his Ministry	404
Convention of Closterseven	406
The Duke of Cumberland. Noble conduct of Pitt towards him	408
General despondency in the country	408
Militia riots	410
Battle of Rossbach	411
Battle of Leuthen	411
The Convention of Closterseven broken	412
Attacks of the English on the French coast	413

German Campaign of 1758

Battle of Zorndorf	413
Battle of Hochkirchen	414
Relief of Dresden by Frederick	415
Battle of Crefeld	415
French successes in Hesse	415
English conquest of Canada	415
Its ultimate consequences	417
English naval victories	418
New colonies conquered	419

Conquest of Hindostan

Capture of Calcutta and Hooghly	419
Indecisive battle with Surajah Dowlah	419
Battle of Plassy	420
Death of Surajah Dowlah. Growing power of Clive	420
The French in Madras. Lally	422
Discord among the French commanders	424
English victory at sea	425
Difficulties of Lally	425
Battle of Wandewash	426
Destruction of Pondicherry	427

	PAGE
Fate of Lally	428
Great sacrifices of the English under Pitt	429

German Campaign of 1759

Perilous position of Frederick. Battle of Züllichau	430
Russians take Frankfort. Battle of Kunersdorf	431
Dresden taken by the Austrians	431
New Prussian disasters	431
Battle of Minden	432

German Campaign of 1760

Measures of Frederick to restore his army	433
Unsuccessful attack on Dippoldiswalde	433
Laudohn invades Silesia	434
Unsuccessful attack on Dresden. Battle of Liegnitz	434
Austrians plunder Berlin. Battle of Torgau	435
Proceedings of Prince Ferdinand	435
Charges of recklessness brought against Pitt	435
Prosperity of England during his administration	437
Pitt's love of war	437
Bloodlessness of the English victories	438
Power of Pitt to raise the spirits of the nation	438
His character as a home minister	440
The strength he imparted to English democracy	443
His moral influence. Comparison with Wesley	443
Relation of Pitt and Walpole	445
Death and character of George II.	447



HISTORY OF ENGLAND

IN THE

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

CHAPTER IV.

THE political changes which immediately followed the retirement of Walpole may be speedily dismissed. For several years they consisted chiefly of the antagonism of Carteret and Pulteney with the Pelhams. Pulteney, as I have said, though accepting a seat in the Cabinet, at first declined office, but at his desire the Earl of Wilmington, the old colleague of Walpole¹ and a man of the most moderate intelligence, became the nominal head of the Government. He had broken away from Walpole on the question of the Spanish war, but was otherwise thoroughly identified with the former Government. Carteret obtained the Secretaryship of State for the Northern Department, which involved the direction of foreign affairs. Newcastle occupied the corresponding post in home affairs; his brother, Henry Pelham, was Paymaster of the Forces, and Lord Hardwicke continued to be Chancellor. With two or three exceptions the Tories were still excluded from office, as

¹ See vol. i. p. 378.

were also Chesterfield and Pitt, who were personally displeasing to the King, and the offices of the Government were divided in tolerably fair proportions between the followers of the great Whig leaders and the personal adherents of the Prince of Wales. In spite of all the clamour that had been raised about the abuses under Walpole, the system of home government continued essentially the same. The Septennial Act was maintained against every attack; and if there was a little more decorum in the government, there was probably quite as much corruption.

The foreign policy of the Government, however, gained considerably in energy, and the change was but one of many circumstances that favoured Maria Theresa. We have already seen that by October 1741 her fortunes had sunk to the lowest ebb, but a great revulsion speedily set in. The martial enthusiasm of the Hungarians, the subsidy from England, and the brilliant military talents of General Khevenhüller, restored her armies. Vienna was put in a state of defence, and at the same time jealousies and suspicion made their way among the confederates. The Electors of Bavaria and Saxony were already in some degree divided; and the Germans, and especially Frederick, were alarmed by the growing ascendancy of the French. In the moment of her extreme depression, the Queen consented to a concession which England had vainly urged upon her before, and which laid the foundation of her future success. In October 1741 she concluded a secret convention with Frederick, by which that astute sovereign agreed to desert his allies, and desist from hostilities, on condition of ultimately obtaining Lower Silesia, with Breslau and Neisse. It was arranged that Frederick should continue to besiege Neisse, that the town should ultimately be surrendered to him, that his troops should then retire into winter quarters, and take no further part in the war, that the

truce should be kept a profound secret, and that no formal peace should for the present be signed. As the sacrifice of a few more lives was perfectly indifferent to the contracting parties, and in order that no one should suspect the treachery that was contemplated, Neisse, after the arrangement had been made for its surrender, was subjected for four days and four nights to the horrors of bombardment. Frederick at the same time talked, with his usual cynical frankness, to the English ambassador 'about the best way of attacking his allies the French; and observed, that if the Queen of Hungary prospered he would perhaps support her, if not—everyone must look for himself.¹ He only assented verbally to this convention, and manifestly hesitated which Power it was his interest finally to betray; but the Austrians obtained a respite, which enabled them to withdraw their army from Silesia, and after a short interval to throw their whole forces upon their other enemies. Two brilliant campaigns followed. The greater part of Bohemia was recovered by an army under the Duke of Lorraine, and the French were hemmed in near Prague; while another army, under General Khevenhüller, invaded Upper Austria, drove 10,000 French soldiers within the walls of Linz, blockaded them, defeated a body of Bavarians who were sent to the rescue, compelled the whole French army to surrender, and then, crossing the frontier, poured in a resistless torrent over Bavaria. The fairest plains of that beautiful land were desolated by hosts of irregular troops from Hungary, Croatia, and the Tyrol; and on the 12th of February the Austrians marched in triumph into Munich. On that very day the Elector of Bavaria was crowned Emperor of Germany, at Frankfort, under the title of Charles VII., and the imperial crown was thus, for the

¹ See Carlyle's *Frederick*, book xiii. ch. v.

first time, for many generations, separated from the House of Austria.

Though the existence of the secret convention was made sufficiently manifest by its effects, Frederick formally and upon his honour denied it, and with a rare refinement of treachery, only two days after he had obtained Neisse by his agreement with Maria Theresa, he signed a treaty for the partition of her dominions, which gave him Glatz and some additional territory.¹ Which of the two engagements he would observe depended upon events, and he ultimately decided to break the convention. The Austrians, he said, had not kept it secret, and it was therefore no longer binding, and he soon captured Glatz and Olmutz. He now held almost all he was likely to obtain; he had little to hope and much to fear from a continuance of the war. He dreaded almost equally an Austrian triumph and a French ascendancy in Germany, and he was extremely anxious again to betray his allies and secretly to negotiate a separate peace. His efforts, however, proved vain, until on the 17th of May he defeated the Austrians under Prince Charles of Lorraine in a great battle at Czaslau, or Chotusitz, in Bohemia. The Prussians suffered very severely, but the Austrians were driven back, with the loss of 18 cannon and about 7,000 men.

The Queen of Hungary at last yielded to the urgent representations of England. She saw that the intervention or non-intervention of Prussia decided the fortunes of the war. She feared that the French, unless speedily checked, would regain their ascendancy in Bohemia, and she at last very reluctantly consented to the Peace of Breslau, by which Austria ceded to Prussia all Lower and the greater part of Upper Silesia as well

¹ See the admirable account of these transactions in the Duc de Broglie's *Frédéric II. et Marie-*

Thérèse d'après des documents nouveaux, ii. 107, 111–113, 119–122.

as the country about Glatz, while Frederick on his part ceased from all hostility, and completely abandoned the Emperor and the French. The preliminaries of this peace were signed on June 11, and the definite peace was accepted on July 28, 1742. The Elector of Saxony also acceded to it, and availed himself of the opportunity of withdrawing from the war.

The conditions of the contest were thus profoundly altered. The first consequence was the almost complete expulsion of the French from Bohemia. Suddenly deserted by their allies, outnumbered by their enemies, and wasted by sickness and by famine, they were driven from place to place, and the whole army was at last blockaded in Prague. An army sent to its relief, under the command of Maillebois, was repulsed and compelled to fall back on Bavaria, and the surrender of the French appeared inevitable. This fate was averted by the masterly strategy of Belleisle, who succeeded, in the midst of a dark December night, in evading the Austrians, and who conducted the bulk of his army unbroken for a twelve days' march over a waste of ice and snow and through the midst of a hostile country. They had no covering by night and no subsistence except frozen bread, and they were harassed at every step by the enemy. Hundreds died through cold and hardship. The roads were strewn with human bodies stiffening in the frost, but every cannon and banner was brought in safety to Eger, a frontier town of Bohemia, which was still in the hands of the French. Prague held out a little longer, but it soon succumbed. The French commander declared that unless he obtained honourable terms he would burn the city, and in order to save the capital of Bohemia, the French garrison of 6,000 men were suffered to march out with the honours of war, and to join their comrades at Eger. On January 2, Belleisle began his homeward march, and the campaign had been

so deadly that of 40,000 men who had invaded Germany only 8,000 recrossed the Rhine. Fleury, who had been dragged into a war which he had never desired, and which he was unfit to conduct, had already vainly sued for peace. His overtures were spurned; and the Austrian Government, in order to sow dissension among its enemies, published the letter he had written. His long life had been for the most part upright, honourable, and useful; and if he assented in his last years to acts which were grossly criminal, history will readily forgive faults which were due to the weakness of extreme old age. He died in January in his ninetieth year. In May 1743, Maria Theresa was crowned in Prague.

The effects of the change of government in England were felt in almost every quarter. Carteret at once sent Maria Theresa the assurance of his full support, and a new energy was infused into the war. The struggle between England and Spain had altogether merged in the great European war, and the chief efforts of the Spaniards were directed against the Austrian dominions in Italy. The kingdom of Naples, which had passed under Austrian rule during the War of the Succession, had, as we have seen, been restored to the Spanish line in the war which ended in 1740, and Don Carlos, who ruled it, was altogether subservient to Spanish policy. The Duke of Lorraine, the husband of Maria Theresa, was sovereign of Tuscany; and the Austrian possessions consisted of the Duchy of Milan and the provinces of Mantua and Placentia. They were garrisoned at the opening of the war by only 15,000 men, and their most dangerous enemy was the King of Sardinia, who had gradually extended his dominions into Lombardy, and whose army was, probably, the largest and most efficient in Italy. 'The Milanese,' his father is reported to have said, 'is like an artichoke, to be eaten leaf by leaf,' and the skill and perseverance with which for many genera-

tions the House of Savoy pursued that policy, have in our own day had their reward. Spanish troops had landed at Naples as early as November 1741. The King of Sardinia, the Prince of Modena, and the Republic of Genoa were on the same side. Venice was completely neutral, Tuscany was compelled to declare herself so, and a French army was soon to cross the Alps. The King of Sardinia, however, at this critical moment, was alarmed by the ambitious projects openly avowed by the Spaniards, and he was induced by English influence to change sides. He obtained the promise of certain territorial concessions from Austria, and of an annual subsidy of 200,000*l.* from England; and on these conditions he suddenly marched with an army of 30,000 men to the support of the Austrians. All the plans of the confederates were disconcerted by this defection. The Spaniards went into winter quarters near Bologna in October, fought an unsuccessful battle at Campo Santo in the following February, and then retired to Rimini, leaving Lombardy in complete tranquillity. The British fleet in the Mediterranean had been largely strengthened by Carteret, and it did good service to the cause. In 1742 it burnt a Spanish squadron in the French port of St. Tropez, compelled the King of Naples, by the threat of bombardment, to withdraw his troops from the Spanish army, and sign an engagement of neutrality, destroyed large provisions of corn collected by the Genoese for the Spanish army, and cut off that army from all communications by sea.

The same good fortune attended the Austrians in every field. In the north, Russia was completely victorious over the Swedes, and the war was terminated by the Peace of Abo in August 1743. A defensive alliance, concluded between Elizabeth of Russia and George II. of England, materially diminished the influence of France in the north of Europe, and a considerable sum was sent

from Russia to the Queen of Hungary, as a pledge of her active support. In May 1743 Bavaria, which had been reoccupied by its sovereign the Emperor in the October of the preceding year, was again invaded, and it was soon completely subjugated. Six thousand Bavarians, with their baggage, standards, and cannons, were captured at Erlbach. A French army under Broglie was driven beyond the Rhine. Another French army was expelled from the Upper Palatinate. Eger, the last Bohemian post occupied by the French, was blockaded, and in September it fell. The unhappy Emperor fled hastily from Munich, and being defeated on all sides, and having no hope of assistance, he signed a treaty of neutrality by which he renounced all pretensions to the Austrian succession, and yielded his hereditary dominions to the Queen of Hungary, till the conclusion of a general peace. His army was withdrawn to Franconia, and he himself retired to Frankfort.

The Peace of Breslau had been chiefly the work of Carteret,¹ and he displayed equal zeal in urging the Dutch into the war. This object was at last so far accomplished that they very reluctantly consented to send a contingent to a great confederate army which was being formed in Flanders, under the direction of England and the command of the Earl of Stair, for the purpose of acting against the French, and, if possible, of invading France. It ultimately consisted of some 44,000 men, and was composed of about an equal number of British and Hanoverian soldiers, of 6,000 Hessians, in English pay, and of a contingent of Austrians and of Dutch. It started from Flanders in February 1742-43, marched slowly through the bishopric of Liège, where it was joined by the Austrians, under the Duke

¹ Frederick, *Hist. de mon Temps*, ch. vii.

of Ahremberg, and by 16,000 Hanoverians in British pay, crossed the Rhine on May 14, and encamped on the 23rd in the neighbourhood of Frankfort. It was, however, soon after hemmed in by a superior French force under Noailles. The defiles above Aschaffenburg and the posts of the Upper Maine were occupied by the French. The allies were out-manceuvred and cut off from succours, and their difficulty in obtaining provisions was so great that a capitulation seemed not improbable. Under these disastrous circumstances, George II., accompanied by the Duke of Cumberland and Carteret, joined the army. A great battle was fought at Dettingen, on June 27, and the bravery of the allied forces and the rashness of the Duke of Grammont, which disconcerted the plans of Noailles, gave the victory to the confederates, extricated the army from its embarrassments, and compelled the French to recross the Maine. No other important consequences followed. Innumerable divisions paralysed the army. The King of Prussia showed hostile intentions. The other German princes were divided in their views. The Dutch discouraged all prosecution of the war, and the allied forces, after successively occupying Hanau, Worms, and Spire, at last retired to winter quarters in Flanders. A deadly hostility had sprung up between the British and the Hanoverian troops, and public opinion at home was now violently opposed to Carteret and to the war.

This great revulsion of feeling is to be ascribed to many causes. The war I am describing was one of the most tangled and complicated upon record, but amidst all its confused episodes and various objects, one great change was apparent. It had been a war for the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction and of the integrity of Austria. It had become a war for the conquest and dismemberment of France. Few sovereigns have been

more deeply injured than Maria Theresa, and her haughty, ambitious, and somewhat vindictive nature, now flushed with a succession of conquests, was burning to retaliate upon her enemies. She desired to deprive the Emperor of the imperial crown, and to place it on the head of her husband, to annex Bavaria permanently to the Austrian dominions, to wrest Alsace and Lorraine from France, and Naples from the Spanish line; and if it was in her power she would undoubtedly have attempted to recover Silesia. Her impracticable temper and her ambitious views had become the chief obstacle to the pacification of Europe. She had scornfully rejected the overtures of Fleury for peace. She refused, in spite of the remonstrances of England, to grant the Emperor a definite peace, although he asked only the recognition of his perfectly legal title as Emperor of Germany, and the security of his old hereditary dominions. She long refused to grant the King of Sardinia the concessions that had been promised, and it was not until a whole summer had been wasted, and until the King had threatened to go over to her enemies, that she consented, in September 1743, to sign the Treaty of Worms. By this treaty she at last relinquished in his favour her pretensions to the Marquisate of Finale, which was then in the possession of the Genoese, ceded Placentia and some small districts in Austrian Italy, and made an offensive alliance with the King for the prosecution of the war. Her present object was the invasion of France by two great armies, that of Prince Charles, which was massed upon the frontiers of Alsace, and that of the confederates, who had taken up their quarters at Hanau and Worms.

England had gone far in supporting her in this policy, but it was open to the very gravest objections. It was one thing to fulfil the obligations of a distinct treaty and to prevent the dismemberment of an empire

which was essential to the balance of power. It was quite another thing to support Austria in projects of aggrandisement which alarmed all the conservative instincts of Europe, and could only be realised by a long, bloody, and expensive war. England had entered into the struggle as a mere auxiliary and for a definite purpose, and her mission might reasonably be looked upon as fulfilled. Silesia had, it is true, been ceded to Prussia, but both the Emperor and France would have been perfectly willing to accept a peace leaving the Queen of Hungary in undisturbed possession of all the remainder of the Austrian dominions. It was maintained, and surely with reason, that England should have insisted on the acceptance of such a peace, and that if she could not induce Maria Theresa to acquiesce, she should at least herself have withdrawn from the war.¹ She had not done so. She had, on the contrary, plunged more and more deeply into continental affairs. By the Treaty of Worms she bound herself to continue the subsidy of the King of Sardinia. She was still paying Austrian troops, and a secret convention binding her to continue the subsidy to the Queen of Hungary, 'as long as the war should continue, or the necessity of her affairs should require,' as well as a project for bestowing a subsidy on the Emperor, on condition of his joining the Austrians against his allies the French, had both been recently proposed by Carteret and the King, and had only been defeated by the Pelham influence at home. The army of Flanders was an English creation, and most of its soldiers were either English or in English pay. By forming it, England had completely abandoned the wise policy of confining herself as much as possible to maritime warfare, and she had also, in direct opposition to the wishes of

¹ See these arguments powerfully stated in a speech by Pitt, Dec. 1, 1743 (*Anecdotes of Chatham*, vol. i.).

the Dutch, added very seriously to the dangers of the war by gratuitously attracting it towards the Dutch barrier.

But that which made the war most unpopular was the alleged subordination of English to Hanoverian interests. On no other subject was English public opinion so sensitive, and the orators of the Opposition exerted all their powers to inflame the feeling. The invective of Pitt, who declared that 'it was now too apparent that this great, this powerful, this formidable kingdom is considered only as a province to a despicable Electorate;' the sarcasm of Chesterfield, who suggested that the one effectual method of destroying Jacobitism would be to bestow Hanover on the Pretender, as the English people would never again tolerate a ruler from that country; the bitter witticism of a popular pamphleteer,¹ who, alluding to the white horse in the arms of Hanover, selected for his motto the text in the Revelation, 'I looked, and behold a pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed,' only represented in an emphatic form the common sentiment both of the army and of the people. The English and Hanoverians who fought side by side at Dettingen, probably hated each other more intensely than they hated the French, and the alleged partiality of the King to the Hanoverians even led to the angry resignation of Lord Stair.

It is impossible to doubt that amid much misrepresentation and exaggeration there was some real ground of complaint, and that England, as was said, was too often 'steered by a Hanoverian rudder.' As the sovereign of a small continental state constantly exposed to French ambition, as a German prince keenly interested in German politics, and especially anxious

¹ Dr. Shebbear.

to have no superior in Germany except the Emperor, George II. had a far stronger interest in desiring, at one time the invasion and dismemberment of France, and at another the repression of the growing power of Prussia, than he could have had as a mere sovereign of England. The Electorate lay nearest his heart. Hanoverian interests undoubtedly coloured his foreign policy, and he had a strong disposition to employ the resources of his kingdom in the interests of his Electorate. The manner in which in the former reign England had been embroiled with both Sweden and Russia on account of Bremen and Verden, the Treaty of Hanover, the exaggerated German subsidies which had followed it, and the undoubted fact that many of those subsidies were rendered necessary only by the position of Hanover, had already produced a jealousy which the events of the new war greatly increased. The treaty of neutrality was regarded as a disgraceful abandonment, and the prolongation of the war, the attempted multiplication of German subsidies, and the too frequent custom of taking important resolutions, affecting England, on the Continent with little or no consultation with the English ministers, were all cited as examples of the partiality of the King. The most flagrant case, however, was his determination to throw the chief expense of the Hanoverian army, in time of war, upon England. After the Treaty of Breslau he declared his intention of reducing the Hanoverian army to its peace footing, as his German dominions were then unmolested, and the expense was too great for their resources, and his ministers in England then proceeded to prevent this measure by taking 16,000 Hanoverian troops into British pay. No measure of the time excited such violent hostility, and the intervention of Lord Orford was required to carry it. Pitt openly declared that the interest of England imperatively required complete separation from Hanover.

In the House of Lords twenty-four peers signed a protest against it, in language so bitterly offensive to the Sovereign that it almost savoured of revolution. They stated that some of the Hanoverian troops had refused to form the first line at Dettingen, that others disobeyed the English general after the battle, that the greater number, 'not contented to avoid being of any use either in front or in the rear, determined to be of use nowhere, and halted as soon as they came within sight and reach of the battle, though pressed by the British officers, and invited by the British soldiers, to share the glory, and complete, as they might have done, the victory of the day.' They contended that 'the future co-operation of our national troops with these mercenaries has been rendered impracticable, and even their meeting dangerous;' they complained of 'the many instances of partiality by which the Hanoverians were unhappily distinguished, and our brave fellow-subjects, the British forces, undeservedly discouraged;' of 'the constant preference' given to the former 'in quarters, forage, &c.;' of the fact that 'the Hanoverian Guards had for some days done duty upon his Majesty at Aschaffenburg,' which, they added, 'we look upon as the highest dishonour to his Majesty and this nation;' of 'the abject flattery and criminal misrepresentation which this partiality, blameless in itself, has unhappily given occasion to, and by which in its turn it has been fomented;' of the many instances 'wherein the blood and treasure of this nation have been lavishly employed when no British interest, and, as we conceive, some foreign interest alone, was concerned.' That 'the interests of one country are carried on in subordination to those of another, constitutes,' they said, 'the true and mortifying definition of a province,' and they insinuated, in no obscure terms, that England was actually in this position, that 'an inferior German

principality was really, and Great Britain only nominally, the director' of the policy of the Empire.¹

Pamphlets, the most remarkable of which were ascribed to the pen of Chesterfield, containing similar accusations in even stronger language, were widely circulated,² and no agitation was necessary to strengthen the indignation at the German policy of the Court. Of that policy Carteret was the special representative. He was usually abroad with the King. He based his power chiefly on his influence upon the King's mind, he cordially threw himself into the King's views about the German war, and he aimed at a German coalition, for the purpose of wresting Alsace and Lorraine from France, and thus compensating Maria Theresa for the loss of Silesia. His arrogance or recklessness offended all with whom he came in contact. Newcastle, especially, he treated with habitual insolence, and he contemptuously neglected that traffic in places which was then so essential to political power. He speedily be-

¹ Rogers' *Protest of the Lords*, ii. 37-42. Speaker Onslow relates the following remarkable dialogue with Walpole on the subject. 'A little while before Sir R. Walpole's fall, and as a popular act to save himself (for he went very unwillingly out of his offices and power), he took me one day aside and said: "What will you say, Speaker, if this hand of mine shall bring a message from the King to the House of Commons declaring his consent to having any of his family after his own death to be made by Act of Parliament incapable of inheriting and enjoying the crown and possessing the Electoral dominions at the same time?" My answer was:

"Sir, it will be as a message from Heaven." He replied, "It will be done," but it was not done, and I have good reason to believe it would have been opposed and rejected at this time, because it came from him, and by the means of those who had always been most clamorous for it.'—Speaker Onslow's remarks, in Coxe's *Walpole*, ii. 571, 572.

² See *The Case of the Hanover Troops, the Interest of Hanover, the Vindication of the Case of the Hanover Troops*. A curious collection of passages from the principal pamphlets against these troops will be found in *Faction Defeated by the Evidence of Facts*, pp. 124, 125 (7th ed.).

came the most unpopular man in the country, and his unpopularity was not atoned for by any very splendid success. There was undoubtedly abundance of vigour, and considerable ability, displayed in the measures I have enumerated; but Carteret did not, like Pitt, possess the art of inspiring the nation or the army with a high military enthusiasm, of selecting the ablest men for the most important commands, or of directing his blows against the most vulnerable points of the enemy. The formation of the army of Flanders was probably a mistake. The issue of the campaign was miserably abortive, and there can be but little doubt that Newcastle judged wisely in refusing to associate England with a project for the invasion and the dismemberment of France.

Under these circumstances a conflict between the two sections of the Government was inevitable. Lord Wilmington died in July 1743, having held the chief power for little more than sixteen months. Lord Bath, who clearly perceived the mistake he had made in declining office, now eagerly aspired to the vacant place, and he was warmly supported by Carteret, who designed to retain for himself the direction of the war, and to strengthen his position by bringing into office a considerable number of Tories. Bath was personally almost equally obnoxious to the King and to the people, but the influence of Carteret over the royal mind was so great that he would probably have gained his point had not the popular clamour been supported by the still powerful voice of Orford, who represented to the King the danger of admitting Tories to office, and the extreme and growing unpopularity of his Government. By the influence of the old statesman, the Pelham interest became supreme, Henry Pelham obtaining the position of Prime Minister. Being the younger brother of the Duke of Newcastle, he was supported by a vast

amount of family and borough influence, and without any great or shining talents he succeeded in playing a very considerable part in English history. He had been first brought into office chiefly by the recommendation of Walpole, had supported his patron faithfully in the contest about the excise, and in the disastrous struggle of 1740 and 1741, and was looked upon as the natural heir of his policy. Like Walpole, he had none of the talents that are necessary for the successful conduct of war, and was, perhaps for that very reason, warmly in favour of peace. Like Walpole, too, he was thoroughly conversant with questions of finance, and almost uniformly successful in dealing with them. A timid, desponding, and somewhat fretful man, with little energy either of character or intellect, he possessed at least, to a high degree, good sense, industry, knowledge of business, and parliamentary experience; his manners were conciliatory and decorous, and he was content to hold the reins of power very loosely, freely admitting competitors to office, and allowing much divergence of opinion. Lord Hardwicke, the greatest lawyer of his day, and one of the greatest who ever took part in English politics, was his warm friend, and he attached to his cause both Chesterfield and Pitt. After a protracted struggle in the Cabinet, Carteret, who, by the death of his mother, had become Lord Granville, was compelled to yield, and resigned office in November 1744.

The ascendancy of the Pelhams in England, however, was far from leading to peace. On the contrary, in no other stage of the war did the martial energies of Europe blaze so fiercely or extend so widely as in 1744 or 1745. The death of Fleury removed the chief pacific influence from the councils of France; and Cardinal Tencin, who succeeded him, and who is said to have obtained his hat by the friendship of the Pretender,

resolved to signalise his government by the invasion of England. 15,000 men, under the command of Marshal Saxe, were assembled for that purpose at Dunkirk. A powerful fleet sailed from Brest and Rochefort for their protection, and the young Pretender arrived from Rome to accompany the expedition. In England every preparation was made for a deadly struggle. The forts on the Thames and Medway were strengthened. Several regiments were marched to the southern coast; the Kentish Militia were put under arms; troops were recalled from the Netherlands, and application was made to the States-General for the 6,000 men which in case of invasion Holland was bound by treaty to furnish. For a few weeks party warfare almost ceased, but in order to guard against every attempt at rebellion, the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, and a proclamation issued for enforcing the laws against Papists and Nonjurors. Towards the end of February 1744, the French fleet appeared in the Channel; and, perceiving no enemy, the commander sent off a rapid message to Dunkirk, to hasten the embarkation, and soon after anchored off Dungeness Point. At this critical moment the English fleet, which was greatly superior in numbers, doubled the South Foreland. An action seemed imminent, but wind and tide were both unfavourable, and Sir John Norris, who commanded the English, resolved to postpone it till the morrow. That night a great tempest arose, before which the French fleet fled in safety, but which scattered far and wide the transports, and put an end for the present to all projects of invasion.

It is a somewhat curious coincidence, that, almost at the same time when a French fleet escaped from the English in the Channel, another fleet had a similar fortune in the Mediterranean. The combined fleet of the French and Spaniards was blockaded in Toulon by the British, under Admiral Matthews. On February 9 it

sailed from the harbour, and a general engagement ensued. The battle on the part of the English officers appears to have been grossly mismanaged ; and the mismanagement was in a great degree due to a deadly feud, which prevented all cordial co-operation between the commander and the Vice-Admiral Lestock. Night closed on the action without any decisive result, but next morning the fleet of the enemy was in flight. A pursuit was ordered, and the Vice-Admiral had gained considerably upon the fugitives, when the English ships were somewhat unaccountably ordered to return, and the enemy made their way in safety to Carthage and Alicante. The escape of these two fleets threw much discredit upon the naval enterprise of England, and the Admiral and Vice-Admiral of the Mediterranean fleet mutually accused each other. There appear to have been grave faults on both sides ; but the decision of the court-martial was given against Admiral Matthews, who was removed from the service, and several commanders of ships were cashiered.

England and France, though taking a leading part in the war, had hitherto been engaged only as auxiliaries, and, though they had met in so many fields, they were still nominally at peace. This unnatural state of things now terminated. In March 1744 France declared war against England, and in April against Austria, and she at the same time prepared to throw her full energies upon the Austrian Netherlands. A French army of about 80,000 men, under the able leadership of Marshal Saxe, animated by the presence of Lewis XV., and accompanied by a train of artillery that was said to have been superior to any hitherto known, poured over the frontier, and was everywhere victorious. It is a curious fact, that among its officers, one of the most conspicuous and successful was by profession a Churchman. The Prince of Clermont, the great-grandson of the illustrious Condé,

was the Abbé of St. Germain des Prés, but the Pope, Clement XII., gave him a dispensation to take part in the war, and he directed the principal attacks upon the fortress of Ypres. The allies were weak, divided, and incapable. In two months, Ypres, Courtrai, Menin, and Furnes were taken, and the whole of the Low Countries would probably have been conquered, had not the invaders been arrested by sinister news from Alsace.

That province had been left under the protection of Marshal Coigny, and of the Bavarian General Seckendorf, whose combined armies were believed to be sufficient to guard the passes of the Rhine. General Khevenhüller had died in the previous winter; but Prince Charles of Lorraine, who commanded the Austrians, and who was accompanied by Marshal Traun, one of the ablest soldiers in the Austrian service, succeeded in deceiving his enemies, and his army in three bodies crossed the Rhine. The war raged fiercely around Spire, Weissenburg, and Saverne, in that unhappy country which has been fated in so many contests to be the battle-field of Europe. The Austrians, with an army of 60,000 men, effected a secure lodgment in Alsace, and advanced to the frontiers of Lorraine; and the French king, leaving Marshal Saxe with 30,000 men, to maintain his conquests in the Netherlands, hastened with the remainder of the army to its relief. The King fell ill at Metz, and appeared for a time at the point of death, but after a somewhat dangerous delay, his troops arrived by forced marches in Alsace, which seemed destined to be the scene of the decisive struggle of the year, when a new enemy suddenly appeared in the field, and again diverted the course of the war.

This enemy was Frederick of Prussia. No prince of his time perceived his interests more clearly, or acted on them with such combined secrecy, energy, and skill; and as he was at the head of one of the best armies in Europe,

and as it cost him nothing to break a treaty or to abandon an ally, he succeeded in a very great degree in making himself the arbiter of the war. By the Peace of Breslau he had once already suddenly changed its fortunes, and brought about the almost complete destruction of one of the armies of the ally whom he had deserted, and he had hitherto resisted all overtures to break the peace. He calculated, as he himself informs us, that 'the longer the war should continue the more would the resources of the House of Austria be exhausted, while the longer Prussia remained at peace the more strength she would acquire.' But, on the other hand, it was one of his maxims that 'it is a capital error in politics to trust a reconciled enemy;' and there was much in the present aspect of affairs to excite both his cupidity and his fears. He was alarmed by the ascendancy the Austrians had obtained in Alsace, and by the prospect of the annexation of Lorraine; by the growing ambition of the Queen of Hungary, which made it peculiarly unlikely that she would permanently acquiesce in the alienation of Silesia, and by intelligence that Saxony had agreed to join in the league against France. It was a suspicious circumstance that the Treaty of Worms, while enumerating and guaranteeing many other treaties, had made no mention of the Peace of Breslau, by which he held Silesia; and George II. was reported to have used some language implying that he, at least, would not be reluctant to see that province restored. Even before the close of 1743 Frederick had been in secret negotiation with France, and the events in Alsace strengthened his determination. Maria Theresa had not committed the smallest act since the Peace of Breslau that could be construed into hostility to Prussia, but Frederick concluded, with reason, that she had never forgiven his past treachery, and he feared that if she became too strong, she would endeavour to

drive him from Silesia. This might be the result if she were victorious in Alsace. It might be equally the result if France, alarmed at her progress, made peace, and retired from the war. On the other hand, the wars of Alsace, the Netherlands, and Italy had left the Austrian provinces almost undefended, and the King saw the possibility of effecting a new spoliation by annexing a portion of Bohemia to his dominions. After some unsuccessful negotiation with Russia, he signed secret conventions with the Emperor, France, the Elector Palatine, and the Landgrave of Hesse; and engaged to invade Bohemia, stipulating that a considerable portion of that country which adjoined Silesia should be annexed to his dominions. In August 1744 he issued a manifesto, declaring that he had taken arms to support the rights of the Emperor, to defend the liberty and restore the peace of the Germanic Empire. He marched through Saxony, in defiance of the wishes of the Elector, invaded Bohemia, captured Prague, with its entire garrison, on September 16, and speedily reduced all Bohemia to the east of the Moldau. At the same time a united army of Bavarians and Hessians expelled the Austrians from the greater part of Bavaria, and on October 22 reinstated the Emperor in Munich.

At this point, however, his usual good fortune abandoned Frederick. Maria Theresa again fled to Hungary, and was again received with an enthusiasm that completely disconcerted her enemies. An army of 44,000 men was speedily equipped in Hungary, while on the other side Prince Charles of Lorraine and Marshal Traun hastened to abandon Alsace, effected, with scarcely any loss, a masterly retreat over the Rhine, in the presence of the united French army, and marched rapidly upon Bohemia. The irregular troops, which played so prominent a part in Austrian warfare, assisted as they were by the good wishes of the whole population, and by the

nature of the country, soon reduced the Prussians to extreme distress. The villages were deserted. No peasant came to the camp to sell provisions. The defiles of the mountains that surround Bohemia swarmed with hussars and Croats, who intercepted convoys and cut off intelligence ; and their success was so great that on one occasion the King and army remained for four weeks absolutely without news. To add to their disasters, 20,000 Saxon troops marched to the assistance of Prince Charles, while a severe winter greatly aggravated the sufferings of the invaders. A rapid retreat became necessary, and the Prussians were compelled to abandon all their conquests, and to retire broken, baffled and dispirited into Silesia. The French and the Emperor were the only gainers. Marshal Saxe maintained his position in the Netherlands. Alsace was freed from its invaders, and the French, crossing the Rhine, laid siege to the important town of Friburg. The Austrian General Damnitz defended it for thirty-five days, till it was little more than a mass of ruins, and till half the garrison and 15,000 of the besiegers had been killed ; and its capture concluded the campaign.

While these events were happening in Germany, Italy also was the theatre of a bloody, desolating, but utterly indecisive war. Maria Theresa and the King of Sardinia were now professedly united, but they insisted on pursuing separate ends. The interests of the King were in the north, and his immediate object was the conquest of Finale. The Austrians, on the other hand, drove the Spaniards southwards from near Rimini to the Neapolitan frontier, when the King of Naples, breaking the neutrality he had signed, marched to the war with an army of 15,000 men. The Austrians, outnumbered and baffled, made one daring effort to retrieve their fortunes, and succeeded, in the night of August 10, in surprising the head-quarters of the King of Naples at

Velletri. The King and the Duke of Modena were all but killed, and a long and most bloody fight ensued. At last the Austrians, who had been disorganised by the opportunities of plunder, gave way, and the victory remained with the allies. The malaria arising from the Pontine marshes soon did its work among the German soldiers, and in November the army retired, in a greatly reduced condition, to the neighbourhood of Rimini, while their enemies were quartered between Viterbo and Civita Vecchia. The King of Sardinia, in the meantime, was engaged in a desperate contest with an invading army of French and Spaniards, which forced its way through Nice, fighting almost at every step, invested Coni, and defeated a large force that was sent to its relief. Genoa would have assisted the invaders, but was intimidated by the English fleet; and, in spite of many successes, the French were unable to take Coni, and on the approach of winter they recrossed the Alps, having lost, it is said, not less than 10,000 men in the campaign.

So ended the year 1744, during which a fearful sum of human misery had been inflicted on the world. Bohemia, Bavaria, the Austrian Netherlands and Italy had been desolated by hostile forces. Tens of thousands of lives had been sacrificed, millions of pounds had been uselessly squandered, all the interests of civilisation and industry had been injured or neglected, but it can scarcely be said that a single important result had been achieved. The relative forces of the belligerents at the end of the year were almost the same as they had been at the beginning, and there was as yet no sign of the approach of peace.

In 1745, however, the clouds began in some degree to break. On January 8, an offensive alliance was concluded between England, Holland, Austria, and Saxony, by which the King of Poland agreed, as Elector of Saxony, to furnish 30,000 troops for the defence of

Bohemia on condition of receiving a subsidy of 100,000*l.* from England, and of 50,000*l.* from Holland. On January 20 the Emperor Charles VII. died, broken alike by sorrow and by sickness; and the young Elector, refusing to become a candidate for the Imperial dignity, made earnest overtures for peace. The Duke of Lorraine, the husband of Maria Theresa, was candidate for the Empire, and the Elector agreed to support him, to withdraw his troops from the war, and to recognise the Pragmatic Sanction, provided his Bavarian dominions were secured, and the validity of his father's election was recognised. On April 22 a peace between Austria and Bavaria was signed on these conditions at Füssen, and in September, to the great disappointment of French politicians, the Imperial dignity reverted to the House of Austria by the almost unanimous election of the Duke of Lorraine as Emperor of Germany. Still more important was the peace between Austria and Prussia, which was negotiated at the end of the year. As may very easily be understood, Maria Theresa felt towards Frederick more bitterly than towards any other enemy. The recovery of Silesia was the object now nearest her heart. Upon the failure of Frederick's last campaign the war had been carried into that province, and, as all the forces that had been employed in Alsace were directed to its conquest, success appeared very probable. The reputation of Frederick was lowered by defeat. The French were concentrating all their efforts upon the Netherlands. Bavaria had seceded from the war, and the King of Poland, having at last extorted from Maria Theresa the promise of some territorial cessions in Silesia in the event of success, now threw himself heartily into the struggle. The extraordinary military abilities of the Prussian king, and the strenuous exertions of the Pelham ministry in favour of peace, overcame this combination. After several inconsiderable skirmishes,

Frederick, on June 3, defeated the Austrians under Prince Charles in the great battle of Hohenfriedberg, and soon after followed them in their retreat into Bohemia. England then urgently interposed in favour of peace. Her ambassador urged that the Austrian Netherlands would inevitably succumb before the French if the German war continued, and he represented how impossible it was for England to continue the payment of subsidies to the allies, which in this year amounted to not less than 1,178,753*l*. The Queen refusing to yield, England for her own part signed on August 26 a preliminary convention with Prussia for the purpose of re-establishing peace, by which she guaranteed to Prussia the possession of Silesia according to the Treaty of Breslau, and promised to use every effort to obtain for it a general guarantee by all the Powers of Europe. The Queen of Hungary was indignant but still unshaken, and she resolved to continue the war. On September 30, however, the Austrians were again completely defeated at Sohr. On December 15 the Saxons were routed at Kesseldorf, and the Prussians soon after marched in triumph into Dresden. Maria Theresa at last yielded, and on December 25 she signed the Peace of Dresden, guaranteeing Frederick the possession of Silesia and Glatz, while Frederick for his part evacuated Saxony, recognised the validity of the Imperial election, and acknowledged the disputed suffrage of Bohemia.

But before this peace was signed events had occurred very disastrous to the interests both of Austria and of England. In Italy Genoa now openly declared herself on the side of the French, and the accession of 10,000 Genoese soldiers, combined with the great military talents of General Gages, who commanded the Spaniards, determined for the present the fortunes of the war. The French, Spaniards, and Neapolitans were every-

where triumphant. Tortona, Placentia, Parma, Pavia, Cazale, and Asti were taken, Don Philip entered Milan in triumph and blockaded the citadel, and the King of Sardinia was driven to take refuge under the walls of his capital.

In Flanders Marshal Saxe, at the head of an army of 80,000 men, was equally successful. The Austrians, in their zeal for the conquest of Silesia, spared little more than 8,000 men for the defence of this province, and the task of opposing the French rested chiefly upon the English and the Dutch. In April Marshal Saxe invested Tournay, and on May 11 he fought a great battle with the allies at Fontenoy. The Dutch gave way at an early period of the struggle, but the English and Hanoverians remained firm, and, gradually forming into a solid column of about 16,000 men, they advanced, through a narrow passage that was left between the fortified village of Fontenoy and the neighbouring woods, full against the centre of the French. Regiment after regiment assailed them in vain. Their sustained and deadly fire, their steady intrepidity and the massive power of their charge carried all before it, and the day was almost lost to the French, when Marshal Saxe resolved to make one last and almost despairing effort. Four cannon were brought to play upon the English, and at the same time the order to advance was given to the household troops of the French king, who had hitherto been kept in reserve, and to the Irish brigade, consisting of several regiments of Irish Catholics who had been driven from their country by the events of the Revolution and by the Penal Code, and who were burning to avenge themselves on their oppressors. Their fiery charge was successful. The British column was arrested, shattered, and dissolved, and a great French victory was the result. In a few days Tournay surrendered, and its fall was followed by that of Ghent,

Bruges, Oudenarde, Dendermonde, Ostend, Nieuport, and Ath.

An immediate consequence of the defeat of Fontenoy was the Jacobite rebellion in Scotland. On July 25 the young Pretender landed, without the support or knowledge of the French, relying only on the popularity of his manners and of his name, and on the assistance of a few Highland chiefs, to recover the throne of his ancestors. A wilder or more hopeless enterprise never convulsed a great empire. The Highlands, where alone he could count upon warm support, contained at this time about one-twelfth of the population of Scotland.¹ Even there many powerful chiefs were bound to the reigning dynasty by the strongest ties of interest. The clans, though they were ever ready to take up arms, and would follow their chiefs in any cause, were utterly destitute of the discipline and subordination of a regular army. Their great object was plunder, and after their first victory more than half the army disbanded to secure the spoil. In the Lowlands the balance of opinion was probably hostile to Jacobitism. The Episcopalians, it is true, were generally disaffected; the Union had left much discontent behind it, and the Scotch origin of the Stuarts was not forgotten, but, on the other hand, the Highlanders were detested as a race of marauders; the commercial and industrial classes dreaded change, and the great city of Glasgow was decidedly Hanoverian. In England, as the event showed, not a single real step had been taken to prepare an insurrection. The King was in Hanover when the movement began, and the greater part of the English army was endeavouring to protect the Netherlands, yet nothing but the grossest incapacity on the part of the military authorities at home, and an extraordinary want of public spirit in the

¹ See Chambers' *Hist. of the Rebellion*.

nation, could have enabled the rebellion, unaided as it was from abroad, to acquire the dimensions which it did. On August 19 the standard of the Stuarts was raised, and before the end of September Prince Charles was installed in Holyrood Palace, the army of Sir John Cope was completely defeated in the battle of Preston Pans, and almost the whole of Scotland acknowledged the Pretender. At the end of October he prepared, at the head of an army of less than 6,000 men, to invade England. He crossed the frontier on November 8, took Carlisle, after a short resistance, on the 15th, marched without opposition through most of the great towns of Lancashire, penetrated as far as Derby, and had produced in London a disgraceful panic and a violent run upon the Bank of England,¹ when the chiefs insisted, in defiance of his wishes, in commencing a retreat.

Three considerable armies were formed to oppose him. One of these, commanded by Marshal Wade, was assembled in Yorkshire, and might easily, with common skill, have cut off his retreat. Another, under the Duke of Cumberland, was prepared to intercept him if he marched upon Wales, while a third was assembled on Finchley Common for the protection of London. Dutch soldiers were brought over to support the Government.² There was no prospect of serious assistance from France, and in England, if the Pretender met with little active opposition among the people, he met with still less support. In Preston, where the Catholics were very numerous, there was some cheering. In Manchester several of the clergy and a great part of the populace received him with enthusiasm, and a regiment of about 500 men was enlisted for his service, the first person enrolled being

¹ See the graphic description of this panic in Fielding's *True Patriot*. It was reported that the Bank saved itself by paying

in sixpences.

² They were afterwards replaced by Hessians. See Stanhope's *Hist. of England*, iii. 299.

Captain James Dawson, whose mournful fate has been celebrated in the most touching ballad of Shenstone. But the recruits were scarcely equal to half the number of the Highlanders who had deserted in the march from Edinburgh to Carlisle. Liverpool was strongly Hanoverian, and its citizens subscribed 6,000*l.* for equipping a regiment in the service of the Government. In general, however, the prevailing disposition of the people was fear or sullen apathy, and few were disposed to risk anything on either side. The retreat began on December 6. It was skilfully conducted, and in several skirmishes the Scotch were victorious, but their cause was manifestly lost. They regained their country, were joined by a few French and a few Irish in the French service, and succeeded on January 17 in defeating a considerable body of English at Falkirk. This was their last gleam of success. Divisions and desertion speedily thinned their ranks. Enemies overwhelming from their numbers and their discipline were pressing upon them, and on April 16, 1746, the battle of Culloden for ever crushed the prospects of the Stuarts. The Hanoverian army, and the Duke of Cumberland who commanded it, displayed in their triumph a barbarity which recalled the memory of Sedgemoor and of the Bloody Assize, while the courage, the loyalty, and the touching fidelity of the Highlanders to their fallen chief cast a halo of romantic interest around his cause.

The extraordinary incapacity of English commanders, both by land and sea, is one of the most striking facts in the war we are considering. Frederick in Prussia, Prince Charles of Lorraine, General Khevenhüller, and Marshal Traun in Austria, General Gages in the service of Spain, and Marshal Saxe in the service of France, had all exhibited conspicuous talent, and both Noailles and Belleisle, though inferior generals, associated their names with brilliant military episodes; but in the Eng-

lish service mismanagement and languor were general. The battle of Dettingen was truly described as a happy escape rather than a great victory; the army in Flanders can hardly be said to have exhibited any military quality except courage, and the British navy, though it gained some successes, added little to its reputation. The one brilliant exception was the expedition of Anson round Cape Horn, for the purpose of plundering the Spanish merchandise and settlements in the Pacific. It lasted for nearly four years, and though it had little effect except that of inflicting a great amount of private misery, it was conducted with a skill and a courage equal to the most splendid achievements of Hawkins or of Blake. The overwhelming superiority of England upon the sea began, however, gradually to influence the war. The island of Cape Breton, which commanded the mouth of Gulf St. Lawrence, and protected the Newfoundland fisheries, was captured in the June of 1745. In 1747 a French squadron was destroyed by a very superior English fleet off Cape Finisterre. Another was defeated near Belleisle, and in the same year as many as 644 prizes were taken.¹ The war on the part of the English, however, was most efficiently conducted by means of subsidies, which were enormously multiplied. The direct payment of the Hanoverian troops, against which so fierce a clamour had been raised, was, indeed, for a time suspended, but the Queen of Hungary was induced to take those troops into her pay. In order that she should do so her subsidy was increased, and next year the Government, without producing any considerable disturbance, reverted quietly to the former policy. The war, however, was now evidently drawing to a close, and the treaties of 1745 had greatly restricted its theatre. Austria, freed from apprehension

¹ Smollett's *Hist. of England*, ch. ix.

on the side of Prussia and Bavaria, was enabled in 1746 to send 30,000 additional soldiers into Italy, where she speedily recovered almost everything she had lost in the preceding year, and defeated the united French and Spaniards in the battle of Placentia. The death of Philip V., which took place in July, made the Spaniards desirous of peace. The command of their army was taken from General Gages, and their troops were soon after ordered to evacuate Italy. Finale was occupied by the Sardinians. Genoa itself was captured by the Austrians, but rescued by a sudden insurrection of the populace. The project of the invasion of Naples was abandoned, in consequence of the opposition of the King of Sardinia, who had grown jealous of Austria, and feared to see her omnipotent in Italy. Provence, however, was invaded and devastated in the November of 1746, and Antibes besieged; but soon after the revolt of Genoa the Austrians were recalled. A second siege of Genoa was raised by a French army, under Belleisle, which burst through Nice, took town after town in that province, and compelled the Austrians and Sardinians to retire. An attempt was then made to capture Turin by a French corps, commanded by the brother of Belleisle, which endeavoured to force its way through the valley of Susa, but it was defeated with great loss at an entrenchment called the Assietta, the commander was killed, and Marshal Belleisle, who had counselled the expedition, and who intended to co-operate with it, fell back upon Nice.

While the fortune of the war was thus rapidly fluctuating in Italy, in the Netherlands it was uniformly in favour of the French. The Scotch rebellion, which compelled England for a time to withdraw her troops, confirmed the military ascendancy which Marshal Saxe had already acquired. In 1746 Brussels with its whole garrison was captured, and soon after Mechlin, Louvain,

Antwerp, Mons, Charleroi, and Namur succumbed. This last town, on whose fortifications the rival genius of Cohorn and Vauban had been in turn employed, now yielded after a siege of six days. The superiority of the French in numbers and especially in artillery, the genius of Marshal Saxe, and the paralysing effect of a great domestic sorrow upon Prince Charles of Lorraine, who commanded the Austrians, made the campaign an uninterrupted triumph for the French, who, soon after the arrival of a British force, defeated the allies in the battle of Roucoux, and became masters of all the Austrian Netherlands, except Limburg and Luxemburg. Next year they invaded the Dutch Republic. Zeeland was overrun by troops, 5,000 prisoners were taken in less than a month, and several towns and fortresses were occupied. The Dutch, who found their republican institutions much more adapted for securing their liberty in time of peace than for giving energy and concentration to their forces in time of war, adopted a policy which they had before pursued. During their long conflicts with the Spaniards they had confided the executive power to the House of Orange, but soon after the Peace of Westphalia had given Holland a recognised place among European States, the hereditary Stadtholdership was abolished and purely republican institutions were created. When the country, in 1672, was reduced to the verge of ruin by the invasion of Lewis XIV., it reverted to the former system and retained it for thirty years. It now again recurred to it, and a popular insurrection made the House of Orange hereditary rulers. The war, however, continued to be disastrous. The allies, under the Duke of Cumberland and the Prince of Orange, were defeated in a great battle at Lauffeld, near Maestricht, on July 2; Sir John Ligonier, who commanded the English cavalry, and who displayed extraordinary courage in the struggle, was taken

prisoner, and the campaign ended with the surprise and capture of the almost impregnable fortress of Bergen-op-Zoom, by Count Löwendahl. It is a curious feature of this campaign that Ligonier, who distinguished himself most highly in the English ranks, was a French refugee, while of the French commanders Marshal Saxe was by birth a German, and Löwendahl a Dane.

In the meantime the Pelham Government, though unsuccessful abroad, had acquired a complete ascendancy at home. The martial enthusiasm of the country had gone down, and public opinion being gratified by the successive deposition of Walpole and of Carteret, and being no longer stimulated by a powerful Opposition, acquiesced languidly in the course of events. The King for a time chafed bitterly against the yoke. He had been thwarted in his favourite German policy, deprived of the minister who was beyond comparison the most pleasing to him, and compelled to accept others in whom he had no confidence. He despised and disliked Newcastle. He hated Chesterfield, whom he was compelled to admit to office, and who had been made Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and he was especially indignant with Pitt, who had described Hanover as 'a beggarly Electorate' and accused its soldiers of cowardice, and whose claims to office Pelham was continually urging. At length, in February 1745-46, while the rebellion was still raging, the perplexed monarch tried to extricate himself from his embarrassments by holding private communications with Bath and Granville. The ministers were apprised of it and at once resigned. The impotence of their rivals was speedily shown, and in forty-eight hours they were obliged to acknowledge themselves incapable of forming a Government. The Pelhams returned to power, but their position was immeasurably strengthened. The few remaining adherents of Bath were driven from office. The King acknowledged with

great irritation that it was impossible for him to resist. He refused, indeed, to make Pitt Secretary of War, but sanctioned his appointment to the lucrative office of Joint Vice-Treasurer of Ireland, and soon after to the still more important position of Paymaster of the Forces.

The great work of the Government was the pacification of Europe by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Another campaign had actually begun when the preliminaries were signed. Russia had at last been brought into the war, and 30,000 Russian soldiers subsidised by the maritime Powers were on the march to rescue the Netherlands. It was not impossible that this powerful reinforcement might have given a new course to the war. In Italy the balance of success was on the whole in favour of the Austrians. The commerce of France had been almost annihilated by the English; her resources were nearly exhausted by the extraordinary exertions she had made, and the returning prosperity produced by the long pacific government of Fleury had been completely overcast. On the other hand, Nice and Savoy were still occupied by the French and Spaniards. The French were almost absolute masters of the Austrian Netherlands; the capture of Bergen-op-Zoom and the subsequent investment of Maestricht had rendered the condition of the Dutch republic nearly desperate, and it would probably have been crushed before any succour could arrive. Maria Theresa, it is true, ardently desired the continuance of the war, hoping to obtain in Italy some compensation for the loss of Silesia, and the Duke of Newcastle was inclined, in opposition to his brother, to support her; but she waged war chiefly by the assistance of the subsidies of England, and her ambition was clearly contrary to the general interests of Europe. Like many absolute sovereigns she appears to have been completely indifferent to the misery and

desolation she caused, provided only she could leave her empire as extended as she had received it. She was resolved also to throw the defence of the Austrian Netherlands almost exclusively on the maritime Powers ; she employed the subsidies, which she received on the express condition of keeping a large army in those provinces, mainly in a war of aggression in Italy ; and she was bitterly aggrieved because the English, under these circumstances, diminished her remittances.

But the King of Sardinia, who saw prospects of pushing his fortunes in Italy, and who was determined, if possible, to avoid restoring the Duchy of Finale, was perhaps the only ruler who shared her hostility to peace. Spain was now governed by a perfectly unambitious sovereign, who wished for nothing but repose. Holland was reduced to such a condition that peace was her first necessity. England was ruled by an eminently pacific minister ; and there was hardly any opposition to impede his policy. The enormous subsidies which England had been for years scattering through Europe were rapidly adding to her debt and impairing her prosperity, and it was not clear what object she had to gain. The quarter in which the French arms were most successful was precisely that most dangerous to England ; and except the capture of Cape Breton, and of a number of prizes, she had obtained little or nothing as a compensation for her sacrifices. Even in India, where the small settlements of France appeared almost at the mercy of England, she had encountered reverses. Two Frenchmen of great abilities and enterprise, but separated from each other by a bitter jealousy, then presided over French interests in India. Dupleix, after a brilliant industrial career upon the Ganges, had been made Governor of the French settlement of Pondicherry, while La Bourdonnais, one of the bravest and most skilful seamen France has ever produced,

directed affairs in the islands of Bourbon and Mauritius. La Bourdonnais succeeded, in the course of 1746, in repelling an English squadron under Admiral Barnet, and in besieging and taking Madras. As express orders from the ministry at home prohibited him from occupying permanently any conquests that might be made in India, a capitulation was signed by which the town was to be restored on the payment of a specified ransom. It passed, however, under the dominion of Dupleix, who shamefully broke the capitulation and subjected the English to scandalous outrages, while La Bourdonnais returned to France and was soon after, on false charges, flung into the Bastille, where he remained for nearly three years. In 1748 the English made a formidable attempt to retaliate upon the French, and a large force of English and Sepoy troops, under the command of Admiral Boscawen and of Major Lawrence, besieged Pondicherry. It was defended, however, by Dupleix with great energy and genius. The rainy season came on, sickness decimated the besiegers, and the enterprise was at last abandoned.

It was plain that the time for peace had arrived. France had already made overtures, and she showed much moderation, and at this period much disinterestedness in her demands, and the influence of England and Holland at length forced the peace upon Austria and Sardinia, though both were bitterly aggrieved by its conditions. France agreed to restore every conquest she had made during the war, to abandon the cause of the Stuarts, and expel the Pretender from her soil, to demolish, in accordance with earlier treaties, the fortifications of Dunkirk on the side of the sea, while retaining those on the side of the land, and to retire from the contest without acquiring any fresh territory or any pecuniary compensation. England in like manner restored the few conquests she had made, and submitted

to the somewhat humiliating condition of sending hostages to Paris as a security for the restoration of Cape Breton. The right of search, in opposition to which she had originally drawn the sword against Spain, and the debt of 95,000*l.* which the Convention of 1739 acknowledged to be owing to her by Spain, were not even mentioned in the peace. The disputed boundary between Canada and Nova Scotia, which had been a source of constant difficulty with France, was left altogether undefined. The Assiento treaty for trade with the Spanish colonies was confirmed for the four years it had still to run, but no real compensation was obtained for a war expenditure which is said to have exceeded sixty-four millions,¹ and which had raised the funded and unfunded debt to more than seventy-eight millions.² Of the other Powers, Holland, Genoa, and the little State of Modena retained their territory as before the war, and Genoa remained mistress of the Duchy of Finale, which had been ceded to the King of Sardinia by the Treaty of Worms, and which it had been a main object of his later policy to secure. Austria obtained a recognition of the election of the Emperor, a general guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction, and the restoration of everything she had lost in the Netherlands, but she gained no additional territory. She was compelled to confirm the cession of Silesia and Glatz to Prussia, to abandon her Italian conquests, and even to cede a considerable part of her former Italian dominions. To the bitter indignation of Maria Theresa, the Duchies of Parma, Placentia, and Guastalla passed to Don Philip of Spain, to revert, however, to their former possessors if Don Philip mounted the Spanish throne, or died without male issue. The King of Sardinia also obtained from Austria the territorial cessions enume-

¹ Chalmers' *Estimate*, p. 105.

² Coxe's *Pelham*, ii. 77

rated in the Treaty of Worms, with the important exceptions of Placentia, which passed to Don Philip, and of Finale, which remained with the Genoese. For the loss of these he obtained no compensation. Frederick obtained a general guarantee for the possession of his newly acquired territory, and several old treaties were formally confirmed.¹

Thus small were the changes effected in Europe by so much bloodshed and treachery, by nearly nine years of wasteful and desolating war. The design of the dismemberment of Austria had failed, but no vexed question had been set at rest. International antipathies and jealousies had been immeasurably increased, and the fearful sufferings and injuries that had been inflicted on the most civilised nations had not even purchased the blessing of an assured peace. Of all the ambitious projects that had been conceived during the war, that of Frederick alone was substantially realised, and France, while endeavouring to weaken one rival, had contributed largely to lay the foundation of the greatness of another.

The definitive peace of England and Holland with France was signed on October 18, 1748, and the other Powers acceded to it before the close of the year. From this time till the death of Pelham in March 1754, political rivalry in England almost ceased. The Tories were gratified by a few places, and almost every politician of talent and influence was connected with the Government. The Prince of Wales, who kept up some faint semblance of opposition, died in March 1751. Three months later Lord Granville, sated with ambition and broken by excessive drinking, joined the ministry, accepting the dignified but unimportant post of Presi-

¹ See on this war Frederick, *Mémoires de mon Temps*, the *Mémoires de Valori*, Voltaire,

Louis XV., and the Histories of Smollett, Coxe, Carlyle, Ranke, Martin, and Lord Stanhope.

dent of the Council, which he continued to hold through many ministerial changes until his death in 1763.

While Pelham lived the leading ideas of the policy of Walpole were steadily pursued. The land tax, which had been raised to 4s. during the war, was reduced in 1750 to 3s., and in 1753 to 2s., though several other taxes which had been recently imposed were retained.¹ Europe being at peace, and the dynasty firmly established by the suppression of the rebellion, the army and navy were both rigorously reduced; 20,000 soldiers and 34,000 sailors and marines were discharged, and some serious distress having in consequence arisen, it was met by the bold and novel expedient of a system of emigration, organised and directed by the Government. As early as 1735 Captain Coram, in a memorial to the Privy Council, had called attention to the deserted and unprotected state of Nova Scotia, to the ease with which the French carried their encroachments into that province, and to the insufficiency of the small British garrison which was collected at Annapolis for its protection. Nova Scotia was justly regarded as the key to North America, equally important in time of war for attacking Canada and for defending New England. The adjacent sea teemed with fish, and its magnificent forests supplied admirable timber for the royal navy. It was accordingly determined to strengthen the colony by encouraging the officers and men lately dismissed from the land and sea service, to settle there with or without their families. To every private was offered a free passage, a free maintenance for twelve months, the fee simple of fifty acres of land, an additional grant of ten acres for every member of his family, and an immunity from taxation for ten years. The officers received still larger grants, varying according to their

¹ See Dowell's *Hist. of Taxation*, ii. 125.

rank. The scheme was eminently successful. About 4,000 men, many of them with their families, embraced the Government officers. The expedition sailed in May under the command of Colonel Cornwallis, and with the protection of two regiments. It was joined on its arrival by an additional force, which had lately been withdrawn from Cape Breton, and soon after the new colonists founded the important town of Halifax, which derived its name from Lord Halifax, who, as President of the Board of Trade, was a principal person in organising the expedition, and which soon became the capital of a flourishing colony.¹

Not less successful was the financial policy of Pelham. The measures which were carried in 1717 and 1727 for reducing the interest of the debt have been already recounted, and another effort in the same direction had been made by Sir John Barnard in 1737. He had proposed to reduce gradually that portion of the debt which bore four per cent. interest to three per cent., enabling the Government to borrow money at the lower rate in order to pay off those creditors who refused to accept the reduction. As the three per cents. were at this time at a premium, and as it was part of the scheme of Sir John Barnard that the contributors to the new loan should be guaranteed from payment of any part of the principal for fourteen years, there is not much doubt that the plan in its essential features could have been carried out, nor yet that it would have been very beneficial to the nation. It was, however, exceedingly unpopular. The great companies who contributed so powerfully to support the ministry of Walpole were opposed to it. A deep impression was made throughout the country by a statement that a very large proportion of the four per cent. funds was in the possession of

¹ Smollett's *Hist. of England*. Coxe's *Life of Pelham*.

widows and orphans and trustees, who would suffer greatly by the reduction. The growing complications with Spain made it probable that the Government would soon be compelled to have recourse to new loans, and especially important that it should take no step that could alienate the moneyed classes, or injure, however unjustly, the credit of the country. Besides this, the Government was now too weak to bear the strain of additional unpopularity, and Sir John Barnard, who originated the measure, was a prominent member of the Opposition. Under these circumstances Walpole, after some hesitation, placed himself in opposition to the Bill. He showed even more than his usual financial knowledge in pointing out the weak points in its details, and he succeeded without difficulty in defeating it.¹

The question of how far he was justified in this course by the special political circumstances of the time is one which can hardly be answered without a more minute knowledge of the dispositions of Members of Parliament and of the currents of feeling in the country than it is now possible to attain. The strong ministry of the Pelhams was able to carry a somewhat similar measure, in spite of the strenuous opposition both of the Bank and of the East India Company, in 1749. By far the larger part of the National Debt was at 4 per cent., a part was at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and another part at 3 per cent. As the 3 per cents. were selling at par, and the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cents. above par,² the

¹ Compare Coxe's *Life of Walpole*, ch. xlvii.; Sinclair's *Hist. of the Revenue*, i. 500-502; and Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, ii. 325-332. It is remarkable that this was almost the only question on which Henry Pelham ever voted against Walpole.

Coxe states that an individual

was said at this time to have purchased 3 per cents. at $109\frac{1}{4}$. This, however, must have been quite an isolated transaction, and the ordinary price appears to have been from par to 101. Coxe's *Pelham*, ii. 77-85. Sinclair's *Hist. of the Revenue*, i. 504-507.

time had evidently come when a reduction was feasible. Availing himself largely of the assistance, without absolutely adopting the plan, of Sir J. Barnard, Pelham introduced and carried a scheme by which such holders of 4 per cent. stock as consented by February 28, 1749–50, to accept the arrangement were to receive $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest from December 1750 to December 1757, with a security that no part of their stock should be redeemed before the latter date, except what was due to the East India Company. After December 1757 the interest was to sink to 3 per cent. till reduced by the Government, while those who refused the arrangement were to be paid off by a loan raised at 3 per cent. The offer does not appear very tempting, but the normal rate of interest was then so low, commercial investments were so few, and the attraction of the Government security was so great, that the majority of holders accepted it, and when February arrived only eighteen or nineteen millions had not been brought under the arrangement. The success, of course, increased its popularity, and Pelham accordingly renewed the offer, though on less favourable conditions, for in the case of these second subscribers the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest was to be exchanged for 3 per cent. interest in December 1755. The result of this prolongation was, that not much more than three millions remained excluded, and the holders of this stock were paid off in 1751. For seven years after 1750 an annual saving was thus made of 288,517*l.*, and after 1757 it amounted in the whole to 577,034*l.*, which was to be applied to the reduction of the National Debt. The success of this measure reflected great credit on the Government, and it furnished a remarkable proof of how prosperous and wealthy the country remained at the close of a long and exhausting war. In 1752 Pelham completed his financial reforms by a measure simplifying and consolidating the different branches of the

National Debt, and thus removing a cause of much perplexity and some expense both to the public and to individuals.¹

It was in this department of legislation that the Governments of the Walpole and Pelham period were most successful. In very few periods in English political history was the commercial element more conspicuous in administration. The prevailing spirit of the debates was of a kind we should rather have expected in a middle-class Parliament than in a Parliament consisting in a very large measure of the nominees of great families. A competition of economy reigned in all parties. The questions which excited most interest were chiefly financial and commercial ones. The increase of the National Debt, the possibility and propriety of reducing its interest, the advantages of a sinking fund, the policy of encouraging trade by bounties and protective duties, the evils of excise, the reduction of the land tax, the burden of continental subsidies, were among the topics which produced the most vehement and the most powerful debates. Burke, in a letter which he wrote in 1752, describing the House of Commons during the Pelham administration, summed up the requirements of a Member of Parliament in one pregnant sentence, which would hardly have been true of the next generation: 'A man, after all, would do more by figures of arithmetic than by figures of rhetoric.'² Even the religious questions which produced most excitement throughout the country, the naturalisation of Jews and the naturalisation of foreign Protestants, were argued chiefly in Parliament upon commercial grounds. The question in home politics, however,

¹ Coxe's *Pelham*. Sinclair's *Hist. of the Revenue*. Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*.

² Prior's *Life of Burke*, i. 38.

which excited most interest in the nation was of a different kind, and it was one which, for very obvious reasons, Parliament desired as much as possible to avoid. It was the extreme corruption of Parliament itself, its subserviency to the influence of the Executive, and the danger of its becoming in time rather the oppressor than the representative of the people.

This danger had been steadily growing since the Revolution, and it had reached such a point that there were many who imagined that the country had gained little by exchanging an arbitrary King for a corrupt and often a tyrannical Parliament. The extraordinary inequalities of the constituencies had long attracted attention. Cromwell had for a time remedied the evil by a bold measure, sweeping away the rotten boroughs, granting members to the greatest unrepresented towns, strengthening the county representation, and at the same time summoning Irish and Scotch Members to the Parliament in London; but although Clarendon described this as ‘a warrantable alteration, and fit to be made in better times,’ the old state of things returned with the Restoration. The Revolution had been mainly a conflict between the Crown and the Parliament, and its effect had been greatly to increase the authority of the latter; but, with the exception of the Triennial Act, nothing of much real value had been done to make it a more faithful representation of the people. Locke, in a memorable passage, complained that ‘the bare name of a town, of which there remains not so much as the ruins, where scarce so much housing as a sheepcot, or more inhabitants than a shepherd, is to be found, sends as many representatives to the grand Assembly of lawmakers, as a whole county, numerous in people and powerful in riches;’ but he could discover no safe remedy for the evil.¹

¹ *On Civil Government*, bk. ii. ch. xiii.

Defoe¹ and the Speaker Onslow² both desired an excision of the rotten boroughs, but there was no general movement in this direction, and the party which was naturally most inclined to change shrank from a reform which might have been fatal to the Government of the Revolution. The Scotch union aggravated the evil by increasing the number of sham boroughs and of subservient Members. If the anomalies were not quite so great as they became after the sudden growth of the manufacturing towns in the closing years of the eighteenth century, and in the early years of the nineteenth century, the Parliament was at least much more arbitrary and corrupt. Only a fraction of its members were elected by considerable and independent constituencies. The enormous expense of the county elections, where the poll might be kept open for forty days, kept these seats almost exclusively in the hands of a few families, while many small boroughs were in the possession of rich noblemen, or were notoriously offered for sale. The Government, by the proprietary rights of the Crown over the Cornish boroughs, by the votes of its numerous excise or revenue officers, by direct purchase, or by bestowing places or peerages on the proprietors, exercised an absolute authority over many seats,³ and its means of influencing the assembled Parliament were so great

¹ *Tour in England.*

² Note to Burnet's *Own Times*, ii. 458.

³ Thus, in a debate in 1743, Chesterfield said: 'Many of our boroughs are now so much the creatures of the Crown that they are generally called Court boroughs, and very properly they are called so. For our ministers for the time being have always the nomination of their repre-

sentatives, and make such an arbitrary use of it that they often order them to choose gentlemen whom they never saw, nor heard of, perhaps, till they saw their names on the minister's order for choosing them. This order they always punctually obey, and would, I believe, obey it, were the person named in it the minister's footman.'—*Parl. Hist.* xiii. 90.

that it is difficult to understand how, in the corrupt moral atmosphere that was prevalent, it was possible to resist it. The legal and ecclesiastical patronage of the Crown was mainly employed in supporting a parliamentary influence. Great sums of secret-service money were usually expended in direct bribery, and places and pensions were multiplied to such an extent that it is on record that out of 550 Members there were in the first Parliament of George I. no less than 271, in the first Parliament of George II. no less than 257, holding offices, pensions, or sinecures.¹ And the body which was thus constituted was rapidly becoming supreme in the State. The control of the purse was a prerogative which naturally would make it so; but during the triennial period the frequency of elections made the Members, to a great extent, subservient to the people who elected, or to the noblemen who nominated them, and gave each Parliament scarcely time to acquire much self-confidence, fixity of purpose, or consistency of organisation. The Septennial Act and the presence of Walpole in the House of Commons during the whole of his long ministry, gradually made that body the undoubted centre of authority.² In the reign of Anne it was thought quite natural that Harley and St. John should accept peerages in the very zenith of their careers. In the reign of George II. Walpole only accepted a title in the hour of defeat, and Pulteney, by taking a similar step, gave a death-blow to his political influence.

It is obvious that a body such as this might become in the highest degree dangerous to the liberties it was

¹ Sir E. May's *Const. Hist.* i. 317.

² Onslow has left on record his opinion that the Septennial Act formed 'the era of the emancipa-

tion of the Commons from its former dependence on the Crown and on the House of Lords.'—Coxe's *Life of Walpole*, i. 75.

supposed to protect, and it showed itself in many respects eminently arbitrary and encroaching. The cases of Fenwick and Bernardi were sufficiently alarming instances of the assumption by the Legislature of judicial functions, but in these cases at least all the three branches had concurred. In other cases, however, the Lower House acted alone. One of the rights of the subject specially guaranteed by the Bill of Rights was that of petition, but it was not then foreseen that the House of Commons might prove as hostile to it as the King. The case of the Kentish petitioners, however, clearly showed the reality of this danger. In 1701, when a Tory House of Commons, in bitter opposition to the King and to the House of Lords, had impeached Somers, delayed the supplies, and thwarted every attempt to put the country in a state of security, a firm, but perfectly temperate and respectful, petition to the House was signed by the grand jury and other freeholders of Kent, recalling the great services of William, and imploring the House to turn its loyal addresses into Bills of supply, and to enable the King to assist his allies before it was too late. A more strictly constitutional proceeding could hardly be imagined, but because this petition reflected on the policy of the majority, the House voted it scandalous, insolent, and seditious, ordered the five gentlemen who presented it into custody, and kept them imprisoned for two months, till they were released by the prorogation. Nor was this all. At the ensuing dissolution Mr. Thomas Colepepper, who had been one of the five, stood for Maidstone, but was defeated by two votes. He petitioned the new House of Commons for the seat, but it at once condemned him as guilty of corruption, and proceeded to show the spirit in which it had tried the case by reviving the question of the Kentish petition, passing a new resolution to the effect that the petitioner had been guilty of 'scandalous, vil-

lanous, and groundless reflections upon the late House of Commons,' directing the Attorney-General to prosecute him for that offence, and committing him to Newgate, where he remained until he had made a formal apology.¹

No less scandalous, in a different way, was the case of the Aylesbury election. In 1703 an elector at Aylesbury, being denied his right to vote at an election, carried his case before the law courts. At the assizes his right to vote was affirmed, and damages were given against those who had denied it; but the Queen's Bench quashed the proceedings, the majority of the Judges maintaining, in opposition to Chief Justice Holt, the very dangerous doctrine that the House of Commons alone had jurisdiction in all cases relating to elections. The case was then carried before the House of Lords as the highest judicial tribunal in the realm. By a large majority, it reversed the judgment of the Queen's Bench, and decided that, the franchise being a right conferred by law, upon certain specified conditions, the law courts had the power of determining how far those conditions were fulfilled. But far from acquiescing in this judicial sentence, the House of Commons at once passed resolutions defying it, threatened severe punishment against all who carried questions of disputed votes into the law courts, and against all lawyers who assisted them, and actually threw four persons into Newgate for taking measures in accordance with the formal judgment of the supreme law court of the nation. The dispute between the two Houses ran so high that it was found necessary to end it by a prorogation.²

In many other ways the same spirit was shown.

¹ *Parl. Hist.* vol. v.; Somers' *Tracts*, xi. 242. Hallam's *Const. Hist.* vol. iii.

² *Parl. Hist.* vol. vi; *State Trials*, vol. xiv. Hallam's *Const. Hist.* vol. iii.

For a considerable time, and especially during the reign of Anne, the House of Commons assumed a regular censorship over the Press. I have already referred to the number of acts of severity against public writers in that reign, and it is one of the worst features connected with them that in numerous cases they were simply party measures effected by the mere motion of the House of Commons. Thus Steele was expelled for political libels, and Asgill on the pretext of an absurd book 'On the Possibility of Avoiding Death.' Defoe was prosecuted by the House of Commons for his 'Shortest Way with Dissenters.' Tutchin, by order of the House, was whipped by the hangman. Wellwood, the editor of the 'Mercurius Rusticus,' Dyer, the editor of the well-known 'News Letter,' and Fogg, the proprietor of 'Mist's Journal,' were compelled to express on their knees their contrition to the House. Whitehead's poem called 'Manners' was voted a libel. The sermon of Binckes, comparing the sufferings of Charles I. to those of Christ, a treatise by a physician named Coward, asserting the material nature of the soul, the sermons of Fleetwood, the Bishop of St. Asaph, were all, by order of the House, burnt by the hangman. Occasionally, as in the case of Hoadly, the House passed resolutions of approval.¹ Of the value of its approbation and of its censure we have a curious illustration in an incident which took place long after the period I am now describing. In 1772 Dr. Nowell was appointed to preach the customary sermon before the House on the anniversary of the execution of Charles I. Only three or four Members were present, and they are said to have been asleep during the sermon, but the House, as usual, passed, unanimously, a vote of thanks to the

¹ Hunt's *Fourth Estate*. Andrews' *Hist. of British Journalism*. Townsend's *Hist. of the House of Commons*, ii. 194-196.

preacher, and in terms of high eulogy ordered the sermon to be printed. When it appeared it was found that the preacher, being an extreme Tory, had availed himself of the occasion to denounce in the strongest language the Puritans and their principles, to extol the royal martyr in terms of which it can be only said that they were a faithful echo of the Church service for the day, and to urge that the qualities of Charles I. were very accurately reproduced in the reigning sovereign. The House of Commons, which was at this time strongly Whig, was both exasperated and perplexed. It was felt that it would be scarcely becoming to condemn to the flames a sermon which had been printed by its express order and honoured by its thanks, and it accordingly contented itself with ordering, without a division, that its vote of thanks should be expunged.¹

There were many other prerogatives claimed by the House of Commons which savoured largely of despotism. The term privilege comprised an extended and ill-defined domain of power external to the law. The House claimed the right of imprisoning men to the end of the current session by its sole authority, and its victims could be neither bailed nor released by the law courts.² It even claimed for itself collectively, and for each of its Members in his parliamentary capacity, a complete freedom from hostile criticism.³ Its Members, though they were presumed by the property qualifica-

¹ *Parl. Hist.* xvii. 311-318. Gibbon's *Miscellaneous Works*, ii. 78.

² Thus in 1699 the Commons resolved, 'That to assert that the House of Commons have no power of commitment but of their own Members, tends to the subversion of the constitution of the House of Commons.'

³ 'That to print or publish any books or libels reflecting upon the proceedings of the House of Commons or of any Member thereof, for or relating to his service therein, is a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House of Commons.' Burgh's *Political Disquisitions*, i. 208.

tion to be men of means, enjoyed an immunity from all actions of law and suits of equity, and were thus able to set their creditors at defiance, and the same privilege, till the reign of George III., was extended to their servants.¹ An immense amount of fraud, violence, and oppression was thus sheltered from punishment, and the privilege appeared peculiarly odious at a time when the ascendancy of law was in other departments becoming more complete. Almost every injury in word or act done to a Member of Parliament was, during the reign of George II., voted a breach of privilege, and thus brought under the immediate and often vindictive jurisdiction of the House. Among the offences thus characterised were shooting the rabbits of one Member, poaching on the fishponds of another, injuring the trees of a third, and stealing the coal of a fourth.²

The abuse of the judicial functions that were properly and reasonably assumed by the House was scandalous and notorious. Even the occasional expulsions of Members for corruption were often themselves the corrupt acts of a corrupt majority, perfectly indifferent to the evidence before them, and intent only on driving out an opponent. The decisions on disputed elections were something more than a scandal. They threatened to subvert the whole theory of representation. The trial of disputed elections had been originally entrusted to select committees specially nominated, and afterwards to a single body called the Committee of Privileges and Elections, chosen by the House, and composed, for the most part, of Privy Coun-

¹ See much curious information about these abuses of privilege in Burgh's *Political Disquisitions; or, an Inquiry into Public Errors and Abuses* (Lond. 1774), i. 205-235.

² Lord Stanhope's *Hist. of England*, iv. 20, 21. See, too, the chapters on Parliamentary Privilege in Hallam and Townsend.

cillors and eminent lawyers. In 1672, however, it was delegated to an open committee, in which all who came were allowed to have voices, and afterwards elections were tried at the bar of the House, and decided by a general vote.¹ This vote was soon openly and almost invariably given through party motives. It is impossible to conceive a more grotesque travesty of a judicial proceeding than was habitually exhibited on these occasions, when private friends of each candidate and the members of the rival parties mustered their forces to vote entirely irrespectively of the merits of the case, when, the farce of hearing evidence having been gone through in an empty House, the Members, who had been waiting without, streamed in, often half intoxicated, to the division, and when the plainest and most incontestable testimony was set aside without scruple if it clashed with the party interests of the majority.² The evil had already become apparent in the latter days of William,³ but some regard for appearances seems then to have been observed, and the partiality was shown chiefly in the very different degrees of stringency with which corruption was judged in the case of friend and foe. Soon, however, all shame was cast aside. In the Tory Parliament of 1702, the controverted elections, in the words of Burnet, 'were judged in favour of Tories with such a barefaced partiality, that it showed the party was resolved on everything that might serve their ends.'⁴ When the Whigs triumphed in 1705 they exhibited the same spirit, and in the few cases in which they did not decide in favour of the Whig candidate the result was ascribed exclusively to some private animosity.⁵ Speaker Onslow, who for thirty-three years

¹ Sir E. May's *Const. Hist.* i. 307, 308.

² *Parl. Hist.* xvii. 1064.

³ Burnet's *Own Times*, ii. 162, 259.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 334.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 429.

presided over the House with great dignity and integrity, declared that it had 'really come to be deemed by many a piece of virtue and honour to do injustice in these cases. "The right is in the friend and not in the cause" is almost avowed, and he is laughed at by the leaders of parties who has scruples upon it,' 'and yet,' he adds, 'we should not bear this a month in any other judicature in the kingdom, in any other object of jurisdiction, or—in this; but we do it ourselves, and that sanctifies it, and the guilt is lost in the number of the guilty and the support of the party without doors.'¹ In the Parliament which met in 1728 there were nearly seventy election petitions to be tried, and Lord Hervey has left us an account of how the House discharged its functions. 'I believe,' he says, 'the manifest injustice and glaring violation of all truth in the decisions of this Parliament surpass even the most flagrant and infamous instances of any of their predecessors. They voted in one case forty more than ninety; in another they cut off the votes of about seven towns, and some thousand voters, who had not only been determined to have voices by former Committees of Elections, but had had their right of voting confirmed to them by the express words of an Act of Parliament and the authority of the whole Legislature. There was a string of these equitable determinations in about half a dozen instances, so unwarrantable and indefensible that people grew ashamed of pretending to talk of right and wrong, laughed at that for which they ought to have blushed, and declared that in elections they never considered the cause but the men, nor ever voted according to justice and right, but from solicitation and favour.'² The true character of these professedly judicial proceedings was

¹ Onslow's note in *Burnet*, ii. 102, 103. See, too, Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* ii. 14, 410.

² Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, i. *Parl. Hist.* vi. 49, 50.

so clearly recognised that a defeat in a division about the Chippenham election was the immediate cause of the resignation of Walpole, and the votes of the 'King's friends' against the Government in election cases formed, in the beginning of the next reign, one of the great complaints of Rockingham. A small majority, consisting mainly of the representatives of rotten boroughs, could thus easily convert itself into a large one, and override the plainest wishes of constituencies; and it is no exaggeration to say that a considerable proportion of the Members of the House of Commons owed their seats, not to the electors, but to the House itself.

Next to the existence of open constituencies, and a fair mode of election, the best security a nation can possess for the fidelity of its representatives is to be found in the system of parliamentary reporting. But this also was wanting. The theory of the statesmen of the first half of the eighteenth century was that the electors had no right to know the proceedings of their representatives, and it was only after a long and dangerous struggle, which was not terminated till the reign of George III., that the right of printing debates was virtually conceded. A few fragmentary reports, as early as the reign of Elizabeth, have come down to us; but the first systematic reporting dates from the Long Parliament, which in 1641 permitted it in a certain specified form. The reports appeared under the title of 'Diurnal Occurrences of Parliament,' and continued until the Restoration; but all unlicensed reporting was stringently forbidden, and the House even expelled and imprisoned in the Tower one of its Members, Sir E. Dering, for printing, without permission, a collection of his own speeches. The secrecy of debate was originally intended as a protection from the King, but it was soon valued as a shelter from the

supervision of the constituencies. At the Restoration all reporting was forbidden, though the votes and proceedings of the House were printed by direction of the Speaker, and from this time till the Revolution only a few relics of parliamentary debates were preserved. Andrew Marvell, the friend of Milton, and his assistant, as Secretary to Cromwell, sent regular reports to his constituents, from 1660 to 1678. Locke, at the suggestion of Shaftesbury, wrote a report of a debate which took place in the House of Lords in 1675, and he printed it under the title of 'A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend,' but, by order of the Privy Council, it was burnt by the hangman. Shaftesbury himself wrote some reports. Anchitell Grey, a Member for Derby, was accustomed for many years to take notes of the debates, which were published in 1769, and which form one of our most important sources of information about the period immediately following the Revolution. Occasionally a news-letter published an outline of what had occurred, but this was done in direct defiance of the resolutions of the House, and was often followed by a speedy punishment. In the latter years of Anne, however, the circle of political interests had very widely extended, and, to meet the demand, short summaries of parliamentary debates, compiled from recollections, began to appear every month in Boyer's 'Political State of Great Britain,' and in the following reign in the 'Historical Register.' Cave, who was one of the most enterprising booksellers of the eighteenth century, perceived the great popularity likely to be derived from such reports, and he showed great resolution in procuring them. In 1728 he was brought before the House of Commons, confined for several days, and obliged to apologise for having furnished his friend Robert Raikes with minutes of its proceedings for the use of the 'Gloucester Journal,' and at the same time

the House passed a strong resolution, declaring such reports a breach of privilege. They were too popular, however, to be put down, and in the next year Raikes again incurred the censure of the House for the same offence. In 1731 Cave started the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' which was soon followed by its rival the 'London Magazine,' and in 1736 Cave began to make parliamentary reports a prominent feature of his periodical. He was accustomed to obtain entrance to the gallery of the House with a friend or two, to take down secretly the names of the speakers and the drift of their arguments, and then to repair at once to a neighbouring coffee-house, where, from the united recollections of the party, a rude report was compiled, which was afterwards elaborated and adorned by a more skilful writer. This latter function was at first fulfilled by a now forgotten historian named Guthrie. From November 1740 to February 1742-43 it was discharged by Dr. Johnson, and afterwards by Hawkesworth, the well-known editor of 'Travels' and biographer of Swift. Reports compiled in a somewhat similar manner, by a Scotch Presbyterian minister, named Gordon, appeared in the 'London Magazine,' and they speedily spread into different newspapers. To elude, if possible, the severity of the House, they only appeared during the recess, and only the first and last letters of the names of the speakers were given.¹

The subject was brought before the House of Commons by the Speaker Onslow, in April 1738, and a debate ensued, of which a full report has been preserved. It is remarkable that the only speaker who adopted what we should now regard as the constitutional

William
D.N.B.

Arthur

¹ See Dr. Johnson's *Life of Cave*; Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, v. 1-18; May's *Constitutional History*, i. 421, 422; and

the *History of Reporting*, in Hunt's *Fourth Estate*, and Andrews' *Hist. of British Journalism*.

view of the subject was the Tory leader, Sir W. Windham. He concurred, indeed, in the condemnation of the reports that were appearing, but only on the ground of their frequent inaccuracy, and took occasion to say that 'he had indeed seen many speeches that were fairly and accurately taken; that no gentleman, where that is the case, ought to be ashamed that the world should know every word he speaks in this House,' 'that the public might have a right to know somewhat more of the proceedings of the House than what appears from the votes,' and that if he were sure that the sentiments of gentlemen were not misrepresented, he 'would be against coming to any resolution that would deprive them of a knowledge that is so necessary for their being able to judge of the merits of their representatives.' The language, however, of the other speakers was much more unqualified. 'If we do not put a speedy stop to this practice,' said Winnington, 'it will be looked upon without doors that we have no power to do it. . . . You will have every word that is spoken here misrepresented by fellows who thrust themselves into our gallery. You will have the speeches of this House every day printed, even during your Session, and we shall be looked upon as the most contemptible assembly on the face of the earth.' 'It is absolutely necessary,' said Pulteney, 'a stop should be put to the practice which has been so justly complained of. I think no appeals should be made to the public with regard to what is said in this assembly; and to print or publish the speeches of gentlemen in this House, even though they were not misrepresented, looks very like making them accountable without doors for what they say within.' Walpole was equally unqualified in his condemnation, but he dwelt exclusively on the inaccuracy and dishonesty of the reports, which were, no doubt, very great, and were a natural consequence of the way in which they were

taken. 'I have read debates,' he said, 'in which I have been made to speak the very reverse of what I meant. I have read others of them wherein all the wit, the learning, and the argument has been thrown into one side, and on the other nothing but what was low, mean, and ridiculous, and yet when it comes to the question, the division has gone against the side which upon the face of the debate had reason and justice to support it.' 'You have punished some persons for forging the names of gentlemen on the backs of letters; but this is a forgery of a worse kind, for it misrepresents the sense of Parliament, and imposes on the understanding of the whole nation.' The result of the debate was a unanimous resolution 'that it is a high indignity to, and a notorious breach of the privileges of this House' to print the debates or other proceedings of the House 'as well during the recess as the sitting of Parliament, and that this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offenders.'¹

The threat was only partially effectual. Cave continued the publication in a new form, as 'Debates in the Senate of Great Lilliput,' and substituted extravagant fancy names for the initials of the speakers. In the 'London Magazine,' debates 'of the Political Club' appeared, and the affairs of the nation were discussed under a transparent disguise by personages in Roman history. Meagre, inaccurate, and often obscure, as these reports necessarily were, they were still very popular; but there was no small risk in producing them. Careful disguise was necessary, and Cave thought it henceforth advisable to print under the name of his nephew. In 1747 the editors of both magazines were summoned before the House of Lords for having given an account of Lord Lovat's trial, and they only

¹ *Parl. Hist.* x. 800-811. *Coxe's Life of Walpole*, ch. 1.

escaped imprisonment by an abject apology. In 1752 Cave returned to the former plan of inserting initials of the speakers, and he does not appear to have been again molested during the short remainder of his life.¹ Many other printers, however, were summoned before the battle was finally won. So jealous was the House of everything that could enable the constituencies to keep a watchful eye upon their representatives, that it was only in the eighteenth century that the votes of the House were printed without formal permission,² while the names of the Members who had voted were wholly concealed. In 1696 the publication of the names of a minority was voted a breach of privilege 'destructive to the freedom and liberties of Parliament.' During almost the whole of the eighteenth century the publication of division lists was a rare and exceptional thing, due to the exertions of individual Members, and it was not until 1836 that it was undertaken by the House itself.³

The system of parliamentary reporting contributed, perhaps, more than any other influence to mitigate the glaring corruption of Parliament, for although several laws dealing directly with the evil were enacted in obedience to the clamour out of doors, they were allowed

¹ He died Jan. 1754.

² In the discussion on the publication of debates, to which I have just referred, Pulteney is reported to have said: 'I remember the time when this House was so jealous, so cautious of doing anything that might look like an appeal to their constituents, that not even the votes were printed without leave. A gentleman every day rose in his place and desired the Chair to ask leave of the House that their votes for that day should be printed. How this custom came

to be dropped I cannot so well account for, but I think it high time for us to prevent any further encroachment upon our privileges.'—*Parl. Hist.* x. 806, 807. In 1703, during the discussions of the House of Commons with the Lords, the former passed a resolution 'that the votes of the House should not be printed, and that this might be a standing order.'—Boyer's *Queen Anne*, p. 47.

³ May's *Constitutional Hist.* i. 439-441.

to a very large extent to remain inoperative. It was useless to arraign offenders before a tribunal of accomplices, and as long as the Executive and the majority in Parliament conspired to practise and to shelter corruption, laws against it were a dead letter. Bribery at elections had been condemned by a law of William III.,¹ and another measure of great stringency was carried against it in 1729. By this law any elector might be compelled on demand to take an oath swearing that he had received no bribe to influence his vote, and any person who was convicted of either giving or receiving a bribe at elections was deprived for ever of the franchise and fined 500*l.* unless he purchased indemnity by discovering another offender of the same kind.² Some measures had also been taken to limit the number of placemen and pensioners in Parliament. In 1692 a Bill for expelling all who accepted places after a certain date from the House of Commons passed that House, but was rejected in the Lords. In 1693, after undergoing material alterations, it was carried through both Houses, but vetoed by the Crown. In 1694 a new Place Bill was introduced, but this time it was defeated in the Commons. A clause of the Act of Settlement, however, carried out the principle in the most rigid form, providing that after the accession of the House of Hanover no person who held any office, place of profit, or pension from the King should have a seat in the House of Commons; but this clause, which would have banished the ministers from the popular branch of the Legislature, never came into operation. It was repealed in 1706, while Anne was still on the throne, and replaced by a law providing that every Member of the House of Commons who accepted office under the Crown should

¹ 7 William III. c. 4.

Abuse of Parliaments, ii. 382-

² 2 George II. c. 24. See *Parl. Hist.* xii. 648. *Ralph's Use and*

384

be compelled to vacate his seat and could only sit after re-election. Occasionally, when a new class of offices was created, its members were incapacitated by law from sitting in the House of Commons. Thus in 1694, when certain duties on salt, beer, and other liquors were granted for the purpose of carrying on the war with France, it was enacted that no Member of the House of Commons might be concerned in farming, collecting, or managing any of the sums granted to his Majesty by this Act 'except the Commissioners of the Treasury, Customs, and Excise, not exceeding the present number in each office, and the Commissioners of the land tax.' In 1700 all Commissioners and other officers of the Customs were disqualified from sitting in the House, and the Act of 1706 extended the disability to all offices created after that date, limited the number of Commissioners appointed to execute any office, and excluded all who held pensions from the Crown during pleasure. Under George I. this exclusion was extended to those who held pensions during a term of years.

Had these laws been enforced, they would have done very much to purify Parliament, but the pension Bills at least were treated with complete contempt. The pensions were secret. The Government refused all information concerning them. A Bill was three times brought forward compelling every Member to swear that he was not in receipt of such a pension, and that if he accepted one he would within fourteen days disclose it to the House, but by the influence of Walpole it was three times defeated. A similar fate during the Walpole administration befell Bills for restricting the number of placemen in the House, but in the great outburst of popular indignation that followed his downfall one measure of this kind was carried. The Place Bill of 1743 excluded a certain number of inferior placeholders from Parliament, and in some degree mitigated the

evil.¹ It was, however, the only step that was taken. Pelham would, probably, never have corrupted Parliament had he found it pure,² but he inherited a system of corruption, and he bequeathed it almost intact to his successors.

The efforts that were made to shorten the duration of Parliament were still less successful. We have already seen the chief reasons that induced the Whig party to pass the Septennial Act, and some of the results which it produced. Its beneficial effect in repressing disorder and immorality, in giving a new stability to English policy, a new strength to the dynasty, and a new authority to the House of Commons, can never be forgotten. It was accompanied, however, by no measure of parliamentary reform, and it had the inevitable effect of greatly increasing corruption both at elections and in the House. The price of seats at once rose when their tenure was prolonged, and the change in the class of candidates which had been in progress since the Revolution was much accelerated. In most rural constituencies it was impossible, when elections were very frequent, for any stranger to compete with the steady influence of the resident landlord. When, however, elections became comparatively rare, money became in many districts more powerful than influence. The value of the prize being enhanced, men were prepared to give more to obtain it; and rich merchants, coming down to con-

¹ See Hallam's *Const. Hist.* ch. xv. and xvi. Fischel on the *English Constitution*, p. 433.

² Horace Walpole, who hated Pelham, and always put the worst colouring on his acts, admitted this. He says: 'I believe Mr. Pelham would never have wet his finger in corruption if

Sir R. Walpole had not dipped up to the elbow; but as he did dip, and as Mr. Pelham was persuaded that it was as necessary for him to be minister as it was for Sir R. Walpole, he plunged as deep.'—Horace Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* i. 235.

stituencies where they were perfect strangers, were able, by the expenditure of large sums at long intervals, to wrest the representation from the resident gentry. At the same time, the means of corruption at the disposal of the Government were enormously increased. It was a common thing for a minister to endeavour to buy the vote of a new Member by the offer of a pension. Under the old system the Member knew that in three years he would be called to account by his constituents, and might lose both his pension and his seat. By the Septennial Act the value of the bribe was more than doubled, for its enjoyment was virtually secured for seven years.

To these arguments it was added that the Septennial Act had a social influence which was far from beneficial. Then as now Parliament contributed largely to set the tone of manners. Under the former system a landlord who aspired to a political position found an almost constant residence on his estate indispensable. When Parliaments became less frequent the necessity grew less stringent, and it was noticed as a consequence of the Septennial Act that country gentlemen were accustomed to spend much more of their time and fortune than formerly in the metropolis.

There can, however, I think, be little doubt that the Government were right in maintaining the Septennial Act, and that a return to the system which had rendered English politics so anarchical in the closing years of the seventeenth and the opening years of the eighteenth century would have produced more evils than it could have cured. It is a remarkable illustration of the changes that may pass over party warfare, that the Republican Milton at one time advocated the appointment of Members for life ;¹ that the Tory party under

¹ See his *Ready and Easy Way to establish a Commonwealth*.

Walpole and Pelham advocated triennial and even annual Parliaments, which afterwards became the watchwords of the most extreme Radicals; that the Whigs, taking their stand upon the Septennial Act, contended against the Tories for the greater duration of Parliament, and that a reform which was demanded as of capital importance by the Tories under George I. and George II., and by the Radicals in the succeeding reigns, has at present scarcely a champion in England.¹ It must, however, be added that recent reforms have considerably diminished the average duration of Parliaments, and that during the whole of the eighteenth century premature dissolutions were extremely rare. In the early part of the century the proposed reduction of the duration of Parliaments was very popular throughout the country. It was supported with great power by Sir W. Windham in 1734, and in 1745 a motion for annual Parliaments was only defeated by 145 to 113.

It is not easy to understand how a Parliament so thoroughly vicious in its constitution, so narrow, corrupt, and often despotic in its tendencies as that which I have described, should have proved itself, in any degree, a faithful guardian of English liberty, or should have produced so large an amount of wise, temperate, and tolerant legislation as it unquestionably did. Reasoning from its constitution and from some of its acts, we might have supposed that it would be wholly inaccessible to public opinion, and would have established a system of the most absolute and most ignoble tyranny; yet no one who candidly considers the general tenour of English administration during the long period of Whig ascendancy in the eighteenth century can question that Voltaire and Montesquieu were correct in describing it as greatly superior to the chief governments of the

¹ Written about 1873.

Continent. In truth, the merits of a government depend much more upon the character of men than upon the framework of institutions. There have been legislative bodies, constructed on the largest, freest, and most symmetrical plan, which have been the passive instruments of despotism; and there have been others which, though saturated with corruption and disfigured by every description of anomaly, have never wholly lost their popular character. The parliamentary system at the time we are considering was a government by the upper classes of the nation; those classes possessed in an eminent degree political capacity, and although public spirit had sunk very low among them, it was by no means extinguished. Men who on ordinary occasions voted through party or personal motives rose on great emergencies to real patriotism. The enthusiasm and the genius of the country aspired in a great degree to political life; and large borough-owners, who disposed of some seats for money and of others for the aggrandisement of their families, were accustomed also, through mingled motives of patriotism and vanity, to bring forward young men of character and promise. Even if they restricted their patronage to their sons they at least provided that many young men should be in the House, and they thus secured the materials of efficient legislators. Statesmanship is not like poetry, or some of the other forms of higher literature, which can only be brought to perfection by men endowed with extraordinary natural genius. The art of management, whether applied to public business or to assemblies, lies strictly within the limits of education, and what is required is much less transcendent abilities than early practice, tact, courage, good temper, courtesy, and industry. In the immense majority of cases the function of statesmen is not creative, and its excellence lies much more in execution than in conception.

In politics possible combinations are usually few, and the course that should be pursued is sufficiently obvious. It is the management of details, the necessity of surmounting difficulties, that chiefly taxes the abilities of statesmen, and these things can to a very large degree be acquired by practice. The natural capacities even of a Walpole, a Palmerston, or a Peel, were far short of prodigy or genius. Imperfect and vicious as was the system of parliamentary government, it at least secured a school of statesmen quite competent for the management of affairs, and the reign of corruption among them, though very threatening, was by no means absolute.

Among the rich who purchased their seats there were always some few who were actuated by an earnest desire to benefit their country, and who, like Romilly and Flood, chose this way of entering Parliament as that which made them most independent. The county representation continued tolerably pure; ¹ of the other constituencies a proportion, though a small proportion, were really free, and some of these, through the operation of the scot and lot franchise, which was equivalent to household suffrage, were eminently popular. All placemen did not always vote with the Government, and all the forms of corruption did not act in the same direction. There was not much public spirit exhibited, but there was always some, and there was much of that spirit of moderation and compromise, that aversion to raising dangerous questions or disturbing old customs, that anxiety not to strain allegiance or abuse strength, or carry political conflicts to extremities,

¹ Chatham, in a speech which he made in 1770, while dwelling strongly on the corruption of the small boroughs, added: 'The representation of the counties is, I think, still pure and uncor-

rupted, that of the great cities is upon a footing equally respectable, and there are many of the larger trading towns which still preserve their independence.'—*Anecdotes of Chatham*, ii. 35.

which has almost always characterised English politics, and which Walpole had done more than any other single man to sustain. Besides this, the influence of the House of Lords and a network of old customs, associations, and traditions opposed formidable barriers to precipitate or violent action. As Burke once said with profound truth, 'it is of the nature of a constitution so formed as ours, however clumsy the constituent parts, if set together in action, ultimately to act well.'

But perhaps the most important guarantee of tolerable government in England was the fear of the Pretender. During all the early years of the Hanoverian dynasty, it was more probable than otherwise that the Stuarts would be restored, and it was only by carefully and constantly abstaining from every course that could arouse violent hostility, that the tottering dynasty could be kept upon the throne. This was the ever present check upon the despotism of majorities, the great secret of the deference of Parliament to the wishes of the people. The conciliatory ministry of Walpole turned the balance of probabilities in favour of the reigning family, but the danger was not really averted till after Culloden, and the Jacobite party did not cease to be a political force till the great ministry of Pitt. There were persons of high position—the most noted being the Duke of Beaufort—who were believed every year to send large sums to the Pretender. Jacobite cries were loud and frequent during the riots that followed the Bill for naturalising Jews in 1753. The University of Oxford was still profoundly disaffected. Complaints were made in Parliament in 1754 of treasonable songs sung by the students in the streets, of treasonable prints sold in its shops.¹ Dr. King, whose sentiments were not doubtful, in his speech on opening

¹ Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* i. 413. See, too, Smollett's *Hist.* bk. iii. ch. i.

the Radcliffe Library in 1754, introduced three times the word 'redeat,' pausing each time for a considerable space while the crowded theatre rang with applause.¹ As late as 1756, when Lord Fitzmaurice travelled through Scotland, he observed that the people of that country were still generally Jacobite.²

Such a state of affairs was well fitted to moderate the violence of parties. The people had little power of controlling or directly influencing Parliament, but whenever their sentiments were strongly expressed on any particular question, either by the votes of the free constituencies or by more irregular or tumultuous means, they were usually listened to, and on the whole obeyed. The explosions of public indignation about the Sacheverell case, the Peace of Utrecht, the commercial treaty with France, the South Sea Bubble, the Spanish outrages, the Bill for naturalising the Jews, the Hanoverian policy of Carteret, foolish as in most instances they were, had all of them, at least, a great and immediate effect upon the policy of the country. It should be added that the duties of Government were in some respects much easier than at present. The vast development of the British Empire and of manufacturing industry, the extension of publicity, and the growth of an inquiring and philanthropic spirit that discerns abuses in every quarter, have together immeasurably increased both the range and the complexity of legislation. In the early Hanoverian period the number of questions treated was very small, and few subjects were much attended to which did not directly affect party interests.

The general level of political life was, however, deplorably low. Politics under Queen Anne centred

¹ Fitzmaurice's *Life of Shelburne*, i. 35. See, too, on Oxford disaffection at an earlier period, the description of the Excise

riots. Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, i. 205.

² Fitzmaurice's *Life of Shelburne*, i. 50.

chiefly round the favourites of the Sovereign, and in the first Hanoverian reigns the most important influences were Court intrigues or parliamentary corruption. Bolingbroke secured his return from exile by the assistance of the Duchess of Kendal, one of the mistresses of George I., whom he is said to have bribed with 10,000*l*. Carteret at first based his hopes upon the same support, but, imagining that he had met with coldness or infidelity on the part of the Duchess, he transferred his allegiance to her rival, the Countess of Platen.¹ On the death of George I. a crowd of statesmen and writers—Chesterfield, Pulteney, Swift, Bolingbroke, and Gay—were at the feet of Mrs. Howard, the mistress of the new king. A curious letter has been preserved, in which Mrs. Pitt, the mother of the great Lord Chatham, endeavoured by a bribe of 1,000 guineas to obtain from her, for her brother, the position of Lord of the Bedchamber.² Chesterfield, towards the end of his career, intrigued against Newcastle with the Duchess of Yorkmouth; and Pitt himself is stated, on very good authority, to have secured his position in the Cabinet in a great degree by his attentions to the same lady.³ The power of Walpole and Newcastle rested upon a different but hardly upon a nobler basis—upon the uniform employment of all the patronage of the Crown, and of a large proportion of the public money at their disposal, for the purpose of maintaining a parliamentary majority. Weapons we should now regard as in the highest degree dishonourable were freely employed. The secrecy of the Post Office was habitually violated. The letters of Swift, Bolingbroke, Marlborough, and Pope are full of complaints of its insecurity, and we know from Wal-

¹ *Marchmont Papers*, i. 3-5.

² *Suffolk Correspondence*, i. 102.

³ See the very remarkable pas-

sages on this subject in Lord Shelburne's *Autobiography*, pp. 83, 84. Mrs. Montagu's *Letters*, iv. 46.

pole himself that he had no scruple in opening the letters of a political rival.¹

Of these facts that which is most really important is the manner in which the Crown patronage and secret service money were disposed of. The system of habitually neglecting the moral and intellectual interests of the country, and of employing the resources of the Government solely with a view to strengthening political influence, was chiefly due to Walpole and Newcastle, and it was one which had very wide and very important consequences. The best argument that has ever been urged in favour of leaving at the disposal of the Government large sums of money in the form of pensions, sinecures, and secret service money, is that the Government is the trustee of the nation, and that it should employ at least a portion of these funds in encouraging those higher forms of literature, science, or art, which are of the greatest value to mankind, which can only be attained by the union of extraordinary abilities with extraordinary labour, and which are at the same time of such a nature that they produce no adequate remuneration for those who practise them. It

¹ Writing to Lord Townshend, Nov. 29, 1725, Walpole says: 'It is fit you should likewise be acquainted that the Pulteneys build great hopes upon the difficulties they promise themselves will arise from the foreign affairs, and especially from the Hanover treaty. I had a curiosity to open some of their letters, and found them full of this language. The last foreign mail brought a letter from Count Staremborg to William Pulteney, giving him great expectations of the materials he could furnish him with, when it might be done with safety, and

very strong in general terms upon what is transacting with you. Wise Daniel fills all his inland correspondence with reflections of the same kind.'—Coxe's *Walpole*, ii. 492, 493. See, too, *Marchmont Papers*, ii. 205, 245, 248. Coxe's *Marlborough*, ch. xcvii., c. *Chatham Correspondence*, i. 167, 168. *Swift's Correspondence*.

In 1723 Walpole even succeeded in making an arrangement with the Postmaster-General in Brussels to open and send him copies of all the correspondence of Atterbury. Coxe's *Walpole*, ii. 284.

has been contended, with reason, that it is neither just nor politic that great philosophers, or poets, or men of science should be driven by the pressure of want from the fields of labour to which their genius naturally called them, or should be tempted to degrade the rarest and most inestimable talents, in order by winning popularity to obtain a livelihood, or should be deprived, when pursuing investigations of the highest moment to mankind, of the means of research which easy circumstances can furnish. That each man should obtain the due and proportionate reward of his services to the community is an ideal which no society can ever attain, but towards which every society in a healthy condition must endeavour to approximate; and although in matters of material production, of which common men are good judges, the law of supply and demand may at least be trusted to produce the requisite article in sufficient quantity and of tolerable quality, it is quite otherwise with the things of mind. In these fields reward is often in inverse proportion to merit, and many of the qualities that are of the most incontestable value have a direct tendency to diminish popularity. As a great writer has truly said, 'the writings by which one can live are not the writings which themselves live.' To infuse into a book deep thought that will strain the attention of the reader, to defend unpopular opinions, or open new veins of thought, to condense into a small space the reflections and researches of a lifetime, to grapple with subjects that involve subtle distinctions or close and complicated reasoning, is a course plainly contrary to the pecuniary interest of an author. The discoveries and the books which have proved of the most enduring value have usually at first been only appreciated by a very few, and have only emerged into general notoriety after many years of eclipse. A skilful writer who looks only to the market will speedily perceive that the taste of

the great majority of readers is an uncultivated one, and that if he desires to be popular he must labour deliberately to gratify it. If his talent take the form of books he will expand his thoughts into many brilliant, gaudy, and superficial volumes, rapidly written and easily read, and, remembering that most men read only for amusement, he will avoid every subject that can fatigue attention or shock prejudices, and especially every form of profound, minute, and laborious investigation. There are demagogues in literature as well as in politics. There is a degradation of style springing from a thirst for popularity, which is at least as bad as the pedantry of scholars, and a desire to conform to middle-class prejudices may produce quite as real a servility as the patronage of aristocracies or of courts. The inevitable result of the law of supply and demand, if left without restriction, is either to degrade or destroy both literature and science, or else to throw them exclusively into the hands of those who possess private means of subsistence.

This is not a matter of speculation or of controversy, but of fact, and anyone who is even moderately acquainted with literary or scientific biography may abundantly verify it. It is certain that the higher forms of literature and science are as a rule unsupported, that men of extraordinary abilities have spent the most useful and laborious lives in these pursuits without earning the barest competence, that many of the most splendid works of genius and many of the most fruitful and conscientious researches are due to men whose lives were passed between the garret and the spunging house, and who were reduced to a penury sometimes verging upon starvation. Neither Bacon, nor Newton, nor Locke, nor Descartes, nor Gibbon, nor Hume, nor Adam Smith, nor Montesquien, nor Berkeley, nor Butler, nor Coleridge, nor Bentham, nor Mil-

ton, nor Wordsworth, could have made a livelihood by their works, and the same may be said of all, or nearly all, writers on mathematics, metaphysics, political economy, archæology, and physical science in all its branches, as well as of the great majority of the greatest writers in other fields. Very few of those men whose genius has irradiated nations, and whose writings have become the eternal heritage of mankind, obtained from their works the income of a successful village doctor or provincial attorney.

In truth, the fact that for many years a main object of English politicians has been to abolish the foolish restrictions by which commerce was hampered, has produced among large classes, by a process of hasty generalisation which is very familiar to all who have studied the history of opinions, a belief in the all-sufficiency of the law of supply and demand, and in the uselessness of Government interference, which in speculation is one of the most superficial of fallacies, and in practice one of the most deadly of errors. Even in the sphere of material things this optimist notion egregiously fails. No portions of modern legislation have been more useful or indeed more indispensable than the Factory Acts and the many restrictive laws about the sale of poisons, vaccination, drainage, railways, or adulteration, and few men who observe the signs of the times will question that this description of legislation must one day be greatly extended. But in other spheres of the utmost importance the law of supply and demand is far more conspicuously impotent. Thus education in its simplest form, which is one of the first of all human interests, is a matter in which Government initiation and direction are imperatively required, for uninstructed people will never demand it, and to appreciate education is itself a consequence of education. Thus the higher forms of literature and science cannot be left to the unrestricted

law of supply and demand, for the simple reason that, while they are of the utmost importance to mankind, most of their professors under such a system would starve. No reasonable man will question either that a civilisation is mutilated and imperfect in which a considerable number of men of genius do not devote their lives to these subjects, or that the world owes quite as much to its writers and men of science as it does to its statesmen, its generals, or its lawyers. No reasonable man who remembers on the one hand how small a proportion of mankind possess the strong natural aptitude which produces the highest achievements in science or literature, and on the other hand how inestimable and enduring are the benefits they may confer, will desire that the cultivation of these fields should become the monopoly of the rich. To evoke the latent genius of the nation, and to direct it to the spheres in which it is most fitted to excel, is one of the highest ends of enlightened statesmanship. In every community there exists a vast mass of noble capacity hopelessly crushed by adverse circumstances, or enabled only to develop in a tardy, distorted, and imperfect manner. Every institution or system that enables a poor man who possesses a strong natural genius for science or literature, to acquire the requisite instruction, and to develop his distinctive capabilities instead of seeking a livelihood as a second-rate lawyer or tradesman, is conferring a benefit on the human race. The benefit is so great that an institution is justified if it occasionally accomplishes it, even though in the great majority of cases it proves a failure. It is, no doubt, true that these unremunerative pursuits may often be combined with more lucrative employments, but only where such employments are congenial, and allow an unusual leisure for thought and study, and even then a divided allegiance is seldom compatible with the highest results. It is also true

that men of great natural powers will sometimes follow their guiding light in spite of every obstacle. The martyrs of literature who pursued their path through hopeless poverty to ends of the greatest value to mankind, have been scarcely less memorable than those of religion. But apart from all nobler and more generous considerations, it is not for the benefit of society that these fields of labour should be cultivated only by those who possess a far higher amount of self-sacrifice than is demanded in other spheres, or that men whose influence may mould the characters of succeeding generations should exercise that influence, with hearts acidulated and perhaps depraved by the pains of poverty or the sense of wrong. It is difficult to over-estimate the amount of evil in the world which has sprung from vices in literature that may be distinctly traced to the circumstances of the author. Had Rousseau been a happy and a prosperous man, the whole history of modern Europe might have been changed.

A curious and valuable book might be written describing the provisions which have been made in different nations and ages for the support of these unremunerative forms of talent. In Germany at the present day the immense multiplication of professorships provides a natural sphere for their exertions; but the results of this system would have been less satisfactory had not the general simplicity of habits, the cheapness of living, and the low standard of professional remuneration made such a life hitherto attractive to able men. In England several agencies combine directly or indirectly to the same end. The vast emoluments of the Universities enable them to do something. In the eyes of a superficial economist no institution will appear more indefensible than an English fellowship to which no definite duties whatever are attached. A real statesman will probably think that something, at least, may

be said for emoluments which, won by severe competition, give a young man a subsistence during the first unproductive years of a profession, render possible for him lines of study or employment from which he would otherwise be absolutely excluded, and enable him, if he desires it, during some of the best years of his life, to devote his undivided energies to intellectual labours. The endowments, whether derived from public or private sources, which are attached to scientific careers, at least furnish the means of subsistence to some men who are engaged in studies of transcendent importance. They are, however, miserably inadequate, and this inadequacy diverts from scientific pursuits many who are admirably fitted to follow them, compels many others to turn away from original investigation, and depresses the whole subject in the eyes of those large classes who estimate the relative importance of different branches of knowledge by the magnitude of the emoluments attached to them. Hardly any other of the great branches of human knowledge is at present so backward, tentative, and empirical as medicine, and there is not much doubt that the law of supply and demand is a main cause of the defect. Almost all the finer intellects which are devoted to this subject are turned away from independent investigations to the lucrative paths of professional practice; their time is engrossed with cases most of which could be treated quite as well by men of inferior capacity, and they do little or nothing to enlarge the bounds of our knowledge. For literature of the graver kinds the Church provides important, though indirect, assistance. In many country parishes the faithful discharge of clerical duties is quite compatible with the life of a scholar; and the valuable, dignified, and almost sinecure appointments connected with the cathedrals are peculiarly suited for literary rewards. Solid literary attainments usually lead to them, and to the tran-

quill leisure which they secure we owe, perhaps, the greater number of those noble monuments of learning which are the truest glory of the Anglican Church.

The disadvantages attaching to this system of providing for literature by ecclesiastical appointments are sufficiently obvious. Such rewards are restricted to men of only one class of opinions, are offered for proficiency only in special forms of literature, and have a direct tendency to discourage independence of thought. They are open to the grave objection of constituting a gigantic system of bribery in favour of a certain class of opinions, and of inducing many who are not conscious hypocrites to stifle their doubts and act falsely with their intellects. To the poor, ambitious, and unbelieving scholar, the Church holds out prospects of the most seductive nature, and he must often hear the voice of the tempter murmuring in his ear, 'All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me.' But, grave as are these disadvantages, the literary benefits resulting from Church sinecures, in my judgment, outweigh them, and they will continue to do so as long as the Church maintains her present latitude of belief, and as long as a considerable proportion of able men can conscientiously join her communion. These appointments have, as a matter of fact, produced many works of great and sterling value, which would never have been written without them, and which are of great benefit to men of all classes and opinions. They discharge a function of the utmost importance in English life, for they form the principal counterpoise to the great prizes attached to the law and to commerce, which would otherwise divert a very disproportionate amount of the talent of the community into these channels. They are especially valuable as encouraging deep research and considerable literary enterprise at a period when, under the influence of the law of supply and demand, literary

talent is passing, to a most excessive and deplorable degree, into ephemeral or purely critical writing. Apart from all its other effects, valuable Church patronage, if judiciously employed, may be of inestimable intellectual advantage to the nation. An ingenious man may easily imagine institutions that would confer the same advantages without the attending evils; but ecclesiastical appointments exist; they actually discharge these functions, and it would be practically much more easy to destroy than to replace them. Strong popular enthusiasm may be speedily aroused for the defence or the destruction of an establishment, but considerations such as I am now urging are of too refined a nature ever to become popular. They are never likely to furnish election cries or party watchwords, and the creation of lucrative appointments, without adequate and engrossing duties being definitely attached to them, is too much opposed to all democratic notions to be in our day a possibility.

Among the means of encouraging the higher intellectual influences, direct Government patronage was in the early part of the eighteenth century conspicuous, and it was bestowed, on the whole, with much disregard of party considerations. Whigs and Tories were in this respect about equally liberal, the Whigs Somers and Montague, and the Tories Harley and St. John being, perhaps, the ministers to whom literature owed most. It was the received opinion of the time that it was part of the duty of an English minister to encourage the development of promising talent, and that a certain proportion of the places and pensions at his disposal should be applied to this purpose. No doubt, this system was sometimes abused, and sometimes had a bad effect upon the character of the recipient; but in itself it implied no degradation. Many of the kinds of labour assisted were of such a nature as to leave no room for sycophancy, and could not otherwise have been carried on,

and the practical results were in general eminently beneficial. The splendid efflorescence of genius under Queen Anne was in a very great degree due to ministerial encouragement, which smoothed the path of many whose names and writings are familiar in countless households, where the statesmen of that day are almost forgotten. Among those who obtained assistance from the Government, either in the form of pensions, appointments, or professional promotion, were Newton and Locke, Addison, Swift, Steele, Prior, Gay, Rowe, Congreve, Tickell, Parnell, and Phillips, while a secret pension was offered to Pope, who was legally disqualified by his religion from receiving Government favours. Upon the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty, however, Governmental encouragement of literature almost absolutely ceased. It is somewhat singular that the son of the Electress Sophia, who had been the devoted friend of Leibnitz, and the nephew of Elizabeth of Bavaria, who had been the most ardent disciple of Descartes, should have proved himself, beyond all other English sovereigns, indifferent to intellectual interests; but George I. never exhibited any trace of the qualities that had made his mother one of the most brilliant, and his aunt one of the most learned, women in Europe. The influence of Walpole was in this respect still more fatal. Himself wholly destitute of literary tastes, he was altogether indifferent to this portion of the national development, and he looked upon the vast patronage at his disposal merely as a means of parliamentary corruption, of aggrandising his own family, or of providing for the younger sons of the aristocracy. It has been said that one of the great distinctions between ancient and modern political theories is, that in the one the ends proposed were chiefly moral, and in the other almost exclusively material; and this last description, though it does not apply to every

portion of English history, was eminently true of the reigns of George I. and of his successor.

It can never be a matter of indifference to a country what qualities lead naturally to social eminence, and it was a necessary consequence of this neglect of literature that a great change passed over the social position of its possessors. Formerly high intellectual attainments counted in society for almost as much as rank or wealth. Addison had been made a Secretary of State. Prior had been despatched on important embassies. Swift had powerfully influenced the policy of a ministry. Steele was a conspicuous Member of Parliament. Gay was made Secretary to the English ambassador at the Court of Hanover. In the reign of the first two Georges all this changed. The Government, if it helped any authors, helped only those who would employ their talents in the lowest forms of party libel, and even then on the most penurious scale. The public was still too small to make literature remunerative. The great nobles, who took their tone from the Court and Government, no longer patronised it, and the men of the highest genius or of the greatest learning were the slaves of mercenary booksellers, wasted the greater part of their lives in the most miserable literary drudgery, lived in abject poverty, and rarely came in contact with the great, except in the character of suppliants. It was in the reign of George I. that Steele, struck down by the ingratitude of the party he had so faithfully served, closed a career, which had been pre-eminently useful to his country, in poverty and neglect; that Ockley concluded his 'History of the Saracens' in a debtors' prison; that Bingham composed the greater part of his invaluable work on the 'Antiquities of the Christian Church' in such necessity that it was with the utmost difficulty he could obtain the books that were indispensable to his task. It was in the reign of

George II. that Savage used to wander by night through the streets of London for want of a lodging, that Johnson spent more than thirty years in penury, drudgery, or debt, that Thomson was deprived by Lord Hardwicke of the small place in the Court of Chancery which was his sole means of subsistence. And at this very time literature in the neighbouring country had acquired a greater social influence than in any other period of recorded history. No contrast, indeed, can be more complete than that which was in this respect presented by England and France. That brilliant French society which Rousseau and so many others have painted,¹ was, no doubt, in many respects corrupt, frivolous, and chimerical, but it had at least carried the art of intellectual conversation to an almost unexampled perfection, and it was pervaded and dignified by a genuine passion and enthusiasm for knowledge, by a noble, if delusive confidence in the power of intellect to regenerate mankind. This intellectual tone was wholly wanting in society in England. Horace Walpole, who reflected very faithfully the fashionable spirit of his time, always speaks of literary pursuits as something hardly becoming in a gentleman, and of such men as Johnson and Smollett as if they were utterly contemptible. The change in the position of writers was at least as injurious to society as to literature. It gave it a frivolous, unintellectual, and material tone it has never wholly lost.²

¹ *Nouvelle Héloïse*, 2me partie. See, too, the admirable sketch of French society at this period in Taine's *Ancien Régime*.

² Chesterfield has noticed the contrast in the usual conversation of the fashionable circles of the two capitals. 'It must be owned that the polite conversa-

tion of the men and women of fashion in Paris, though not always very deep, is much less futile and frivolous than ours here. It turns at least upon some subject, something of taste, some point of history, criticism, and even philosophy; which, though probably not quite so

We must, however, make an exception to this censure. The influence of Queen Caroline in patronage was for many years most judiciously exercised. This very remarkable woman, who governed her husband with an absolute sway in spite of his infidelities, and who often exhibited an insight into character, a force of expression, and a political judgment worthy of a great statesman, was the firmest of all the friends of Walpole, and deserves a large share of the credit which is given to his administration. She first fully reconciled her husband to him. She supported him through innumerable intrigues, and every act of policy was determined together by the minister and the Queen before it was submitted to the King. Unlike Walpole, however, and unlike her husband, who despised every form of literature and art, she had strong intellectual sympathies, which she sometimes displayed with a little pedantry, but which on the whole she exercised to the great advantage of the community. She was the friend and correspondent of Leibnitz,¹ and, in spite of the ridicule of many of the

solid as Mr. Locke's, is, however, better and more becoming rational beings than our frivolous dissertations upon the weather or upon whist.'—*Letters to his Son*, April 22, 1752.

So another writer observes: 'A knowledge of books, a taste in arts, a proficiency in science, was formerly regarded as a proper qualification in a man of fashion. . . . It will not, I presume, be regarded as any kind of satire on the present age to say that among the higher ranks this literary spirit is generally vanished. Reading is now sunk at best into a morning's amusement.'—Browne's *Estimate of the Times*, i. 41, 42.

¹ It is curious how extremely badly she wrote French. Her letters are so misspelt and ungrammatical as to be sometimes nearly unintelligible, and she always chose that language for corresponding with Leibnitz. The following specimen from one of her letters to Leibnitz gives an idea of her attainments in two languages in 1715: 'Vous aurais remarqué dans le rapport contre le dernier ministre que le feu Lord Boulbrouck dit que les françois sont ausy mechant poette que les anglois politicien. Je suis pourtant fort pour ceu de cornelle, Racine, beaulau, Rénie. Il se peut que ne possitan pas sy bien la langue anglois que la

English nobles, the warm and steady patron of Handel. By her influence the poet Savage, when under sentence of death, received his pardon, the Nonjuror historian Carte was recalled from exile, the Arian Whiston was assisted by a pension. Her generosity was at once wide and discriminating, and singularly unfettered by the prejudices of her time. She secured for the Scotch Jacobites at Edinburgh permission to worship in peace; and although her own views were as far as possible removed from their theology,¹ she was a special benefactress of the persecuted Catholics. She contributed largely from her private means to encourage needy talent, and she exercised a great and most useful influence upon Church patronage. There has seldom been a time in which the religious tone was lower than in the age of the first two Georges, but it is a remarkable fact that this age can boast of the two greatest intellects that have ever adorned the Protestant Episcopate. Butler was drawn from his retirement by Caroline, was appointed chaplain, and recommended by her on her death-bed, and to that recommendation he himself attributed his subsequent promotion. Berkeley was first offered a bishopric by the Queen, but being at this time absorbed by his famous missionary scheme he declined it. She tried also earnestly and repeatedly to induce Clarke to accept a seat on the bench, but he resolutely refused, declaring that nothing would induce him again to subscribe the Articles. She secured the

françoise j'admire plus se que j'antan.'—Kemble's *State Papers and Letters*, p. 532.

¹ She had refused to marry the Archduke Charles, afterwards Emperor, because he was a Catholic, and she could not change her faith. Gay wrote of her—

The pomp of titles easy faith might shake;
She scorned an empire for religion's sake.

She appears, however, to have had very little religious feeling, and her opinions on those subjects, as far as she had any, were of a latitudinarian cast.

promotion of Sherlock, contrary to the wish of Walpole. She favoured the promotion of Hoadly and of Secker, and she endeavoured to draw the saintly Wilson from his obscure diocese in the Isle of Man to a more prominent and lucrative position, but he answered that 'he would not in his old age desert his wife because she was poor.' On the death of the Queen, however, Church patronage, like all other patronage, degenerated into a mere matter of party or personal interest. It was distributed for the most part among the members or adherents of the great families, subject to the conditions that the candidates were moderate in their views, and were not inclined to any description of reform.¹

It is not surprising that under such circumstances the spirit of the nation should have sunk very low. In the period between the Reformation and the Revolution, England had been convulsed by some of the strongest passions of which large bodies of men are susceptible. The religious enthusiasm that accompanies great changes and conflicts of dogmatic belief, the enthusiasm of patriotism elicited by a deadly contest with a foreign enemy, the enthusiasm of liberty struggling with despotism, and the enthusiasm of loyalty struggling with innovation, had been the animating principles of large bodies of Englishmen. Different as are these enthusiasms in their nature and their objects, various as are the minds on which they operate, and great as are in some cases the evils that accompany their excess, they have all the com-

¹ 'I would no more employ a man to govern and influence the clergy,' said Sir R. Walpole, 'who did not flatter the parsons, or who either talked, wrote, or acted against their authority, their profits, or their privileges, than I would try to govern the soldiery by setting a general over

them who was always haranguing against the inconveniences of a standing army, or make a man Chancellor who was constantly complaining of the grievances of the Bar and threatening to rectify the abuses of Westminster Hall.'—Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, i. 453, 454.

mon property of kindling in large bodies of men an heroic self-sacrifice, of teaching them to subordinate material to moral ends, and of thus raising the tone of political life. All these enthusiasms had now gradually subsided, while the philanthropic and reforming spirit, which in the nineteenth century has in a great degree taken their place, was almost absolutely unfelt. With a Church teaching a cold and colourless morality, and habitually discouraging every exhibition of zeal, with a dynasty accepted as necessary to the country, but essentially foreign in its origin, its character, and its sympathies, with a Government mild and tolerant, indeed, but selfish, corrupt, and hostile to reform, the nation gradually sank into a condition of selfish apathy. In very few periods was there so little religious zeal, or active loyalty, or public spirit. A kindred tone pervaded the higher branches of intellect. The philosophy of Locke, deriving our ideas mainly, if not exclusively, from external sources, was supreme among the stronger minds. In literature, in art, in speculation, the imagination was repressed; strong passions, elevated motives, and sublime aspirations were replaced by critical accuracy of thought and observation, by a measured and fastidious beauty of form, by clearness, symmetry, sobriety, and good sense. We find this alike in the prose of Addison, in the poetry of Pope, and in the philosophy of Hume. The greatest wit and the most original genius of the age was also the most intensely and the most coarsely realistic. The greatest English painter of the time devoted himself mainly to caricature. The architects could see nothing but barbarous deformity in the Gothic cathedral, and their own works had touched the very nadir of taste.

The long war which began in 1739 failed signally to arouse the energies of the nation. It involved no great principle that could touch the deeper chords of national feeling. It was carried on chiefly by means

of subsidies. It was one of the most ill-directed, ill-executed, and unsuccessful that England had ever waged, and the people, who saw Hanoverian influence in every campaign, looked with an ominous supineness upon its vicissitudes. Good judges spoke with great despondency of the decline of public spirit as if the energy of the people had been fatally impaired. Their attitude during the rebellion of 1745 was justly regarded as extremely alarming. It appeared as if all interest in those great questions which had convulsed England in the time of the Commonwealth and of the Revolution had died away—as if even the old courage of the nation was extinct. Nothing can be more significant than the language of contemporary statesmen on the subject. ‘I apprehend,’ wrote old Horace Walpole when the news of the arrival of the Pretender was issued, ‘that the people may perhaps look on and cry “Fight dog! fight bear!” if they do no worse.’¹ ‘England,’ wrote Henry Fox, ‘Wade says, and I believe, is for the first comer, and if you can tell whether the 6,000 Dutch and ten battalions of English, or 5,000 French and Spaniards will be here first, you know our fate.’ ‘The French are not come—God be thanked! But had 5,000 landed in any part of this island a week ago, I verily believe the entire conquest of it would not have cost them a battle.’ Alderman Heathcote, writing to the Earl of Marchmont in September 1745, and describing the condition of the country, no doubt indicated very truly the causes of the decline. ‘Your Lordship will do me the justice,’ he writes, ‘to believe that it is with the utmost concern I have observed a remarkable change in the dispositions of the people within these two years; for numbers of

¹ Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors*, vi. 236–238. Walpole's *Letters*, ii. 65 (note).

them, who, during the apprehensions of the last invasion, appeared most zealous for the Government, are now grown absolutely cold and indifferent, so that except in the persons in the pay of the Government and a few Dissenters, there is not the least appearance of apprehension or concern to be met with. As an evidence of this truth, your Lordship may observe the little influence an actual insurrection has had on the public funds; and unless some speedy stop be put to this universal coldness by satisfying the demands of the nation and suppressing by proper laws that parliamentary prostitution which has destroyed our armies, our fleets, and our constitution, I greatly fear the event.' ¹ The Government looked upon the attitude of the people simply as furnishing an argument for increasing the standing army, but the fact itself they admitted as freely as their opponents. 'When the late rebellion broke out,' says Lord Hardwicke in 1749, 'I believe most men were convinced that if the rebels had succeeded, Popery as well as slavery would have been the certain consequence, and yet what a faint resistance did the people make in any part of the kingdom!—so faint that had we not been so lucky as to procure a number of regular troops from abroad time enough to oppose their approach, they might have got possession of our capital without any opposition except from the few soldiers we had in London.' ²

These statements are very remarkable, and they are especially so because the apathy that was shown was not due to any sympathy with the Pretender. The disgraceful terror which seized London when the news of the Jacobite march upon Derby arrived was a sufficient evidence of the fact. 'In every place we passed through,' wrote the Jacobite historian of the rebellion, 'we found the English very ill-disposed towards us, except at

¹ *Marchmont Papers*, ii. 342, 343.

² *Campbell's Lives of the Chancellors*, vi. 256, 257.

Manchester. . . . The English peasants were hostile towards us in the highest degree.'¹ When a prisoner who was for a time believed to be the Young Pretender was brought to London, it was with the utmost difficulty that his escort could conduct him to the Tower through a savage mob, who desired to tear him limb from limb.² Even in Manchester, the day of thanksgiving for the suppression of the rebellion was celebrated by the populace, who insulted the nearest relatives of those who had perished on the gallows, and compelled them to subscribe to the illuminations. In Liverpool a Roman Catholic chapel was burnt, and all who were supposed to be guilty of Jacobite tendencies were in serious danger.³ Nor did the executions which followed the suppression of the movement excite any general compassion. 'Popularity,' wrote Horace Walpole at this time, 'has changed sides since the year '15, for now the city and the generality are very angry that so many rebels have been pardoned.'⁴

The impression which this indifference to public interests produced in the minds of many observers was well expressed in a work which appeared in 1757 and 1758. Browne's 'Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times' is now hardly remembered except by brief and disparaging notices in one of the later writings of Burke and in one of the 'Essays' of Macaulay; but it had once a wide popularity and a considerable influence on public opinion. Its author was a clergyman well known in the history of ethics by his answer to Shaftesbury, which contains one of the ablest defences in English literature of the utilitarian theory

¹ Johnstone's *Memoirs of the Rebellion*, pp. 70, 81.

² Walpole's *Letters to Mann*, Dec. 9, 1745.

³ Picton's *Memorials of Liverpool*, vol. i.

⁴ Walpole's *Letters to Mann*, August 12, 1746.

of morals. His object was to warn the country of the utter ruin that must ensue from a decadence of the national spirit, which he maintained was only too manifest, and which he attributed mainly to an excessive development of the commercial spirit. He fully admits that constitutional liberty had been considerably enlarged, that a spirit of growing humanity was exhibited both in manners and in laws; that the administration of justice was generally pure, and that the age was not characterised by gross or profligate vice. Its leading quality was 'a vain, luxurious, and selfish effeminacy,' which was rapidly corroding all the elements of the national strength. 'Love of our country,' he complained, 'is no longer felt, and except in a few minds of uncommon greatness, the principle of public spirit exists not.' He appealed to the disuse of manly occupations among the higher classes, to their general indifference to religious doctrines and neglect of religious practices, to the ever-widening circle of corruption which had now passed from the Parliament to the constituencies, and tainted all the approaches of public life; to the prevailing system of filling the most important offices in the most critical times by family interest, and without any regard to merit or to knowledge. The extent of this evil, he maintained, was but too plainly shown in the contrast between the splendid victories of Marlborough and the almost uniform failure of the British arms in the late war, in the want of fire, energy, and heroism manifested in all public affairs, and, above all, in the conduct of the nation during the rebellion, 'when those of every rank above a constable, instead of arming themselves and encouraging the people, generally fled before the rebels; while a mob of ragged Highlanders marched unmolested to the heart of a populous kingdom.' He argued with much acuteness that the essential qualities

of national greatness are moral, and that no increase of material resources could compensate for the deterioration which had in this respect passed over the English people.

It is, perhaps, difficult for us, who judge these predictions in the light which is furnished by the Methodist revival, and by the splendours of the administration of Chatham, to do full justice to their author. He appears to have been constitutionally a very desponding man, and he ended his life by suicide. The shadows of his picture are undoubtedly overcharged, and the marked revival of public spirit in the succeeding reign, when commerce was far more extended than under George II., proves conclusively that he had formed a very erroneous estimate of the influence of the commercial spirit. Yet it is certain that the disease, though it might still be arrested, was a real one, and its causes, as we have seen, are not difficult to trace. There was, undoubtedly, less of gross and open profligacy than in the evil days of the Restoration, and less of deliberate and organised treachery among statesmen than in the years that immediately followed the Revolution. The fault of the time was not so much the amount of vice as the defect of virtue, the general depression of motives, the unusual absence of unselfish and disinterested action. At the same time, though there had been a certain suspension of the moral influences that had formerly acted upon English society, the conditions of that society were at bottom sound, and contrasted in most respects favourably with those of the greatest nations on the Continent. In the middle of the eighteenth century the peasants of Germany were uniformly serfs, and the peasantry of France, though freed from the most oppressive, were still subject to some of the most irritating of feudal burdens, while in both countries political liberty was unknown, and in France, at least, religious and intellectual freedom were perpetually violated. In France,

too, that fatal division of classes which has been the parent of most subsequent disasters, was already accomplished. The selfish infatuation of the Court which desired to attract to itself all that was splendid in the community, the growing centralisation of government, the want in the upper classes of all taste for country sports and duties, and the increasing attraction of town life, had led the richer classes almost invariably to abandon their estates for the pleasures of the capital, where, in the absence of healthy political life, they lost all sympathy with their fellow-countrymen, and speedily degenerated into hypocrites or profligates. Their tenants, on the other hand, deprived of the softening influence of contact with their superiors, reduced to penury by grinding and unequal taxation, and finding in the village priest their only type of civilisation, sank into that precise condition which transforms some men into the most implacable revolutionists, and others into the most superstitious of bigots. But in England nothing of this kind took place. The mixture of classes, on which English liberty and the perfection of the English type so largely depends, still continued. The country gentlemen were actively employed upon their estates, administering a rude justice, coming into constant and intimate connection with their tenants, and acquiring in the duties, associations, and even sports of a country life, elements of a practical political knowledge more valuable than any that can be acquired in books. Habits of hard and honest industry, a respect for domestic life, unflinching personal courage, were still general through the middle classes and among the poor, and if the last was suspected during the rebellion, it was at least abundantly displayed by the British infantry at Dettingen and Fontenoy. While all these subsisted, there remained elements of greatness which might easily, under favourable circumstances, be fanned into a flame.

It must be added, too, that the qualities most needed for the success of constitutional government, are not the highest, but what may be called the middle virtues of character and intellect. Heroic self-sacrifice, brilliant genius, a lofty level of generosity, intelligence, or morality, a clear perception of the connection and logical tendency of principles, have all, no doubt, their places under this as under other forms of government; but it is upon the wide diffusion of quite a different category of qualities or attainments that the permanence of constitutional government mainly depends. Patience, moderation, persevering energy, the spirit of compromise, a tolerance of difference of opinions, a general interest in public affairs, sound sense, love of order, a disposition to judge measures by actual working and not by any ideal theory, a love of practical improvement, and a great distrust of speculative politics, a dislike to change as change, combined with a readiness to recognise necessities when they arise, are the qualities which must be generally diffused through a community before free institutions can take firm root among them. Judged by these tests the period we are considering exhibited, no doubt, in several respects a great decadence and deficiency, but not so great as if we measured it by a more ideal standard, and it may be safely asserted that in no other great nation were these qualities at this time so commonly exhibited.

A very similar judgment may be passed upon the system of government. It was corrupt, inefficient, and unheroic, but it was free from the gross vices of continental administrations; it was moderate, tolerant, and economical; it was, with all its faults, a free government, and it contained in itself the elements of reformation.

I have examined in a former chapter the theory according to which the rival English parties have exchanged their principles since the early years of the

eighteenth century, and I have endeavoured to show that it is substantially erroneous, and that the historic identity of each party may be clearly established, whether we consider the interests it represented, or the leading principles of its policy. We are now, however, in a position to see more clearly the facts which have given that theory its plausibility. The ministries of Walpole and Pelham represented especially the commercial classes and the Dissenters, aimed beyond all things at the maintenance of the type of monarchy established by the Revolution, and leaned almost uniformly towards those principles of religious liberty which the Tory party detested; but undisputed power had made them corrupt, selfish, and apathetic, and they sought, both in their own interest and in that of the dynasty, to check every reform that could either abridge their power or arouse strong passions in the nation. They also made it a great end of their policy to humour and conciliate to the utmost the country gentry, who were the natural opponents of their party. Though not Tory, they were in the true sense of the word Conservative, Governments; that is to say, Governments of which the supreme object and preoccupation was not the realisation of any unattained political ideal, or the redressing of any political grievances, but merely the maintenance of existing institutions against all assailants. The lines of party division were blurred and confused, and while only those who called themselves Whigs were in general admitted to power, many were ranked in that category who, in a time of keener party struggles, would have been enrolled among the Tories.

The characteristics of the two great parties have varied much with different circumstances. The idiosyncrasies of leaders whose attachment to their respective parties was often in the first instance due to the mere accident of birth or of position, the calm or luring aspect of foreign

affairs, the dominant passion of the nation, the question whether a party is in office or in opposition, whether if in power its position is precarious or secure, and if in opposition it is likely soon to incur the responsibilities of office, have all their great influence on party politics. Still there is a real natural history of parties, and the division corresponds roughly to certain broad distinctions of mind and character that never can be effaced. The distinctions between content and hope, between caution and confidence, between the imagination that throws a halo of reverent association around the past and that which opens out brilliant vistas of improvement in the future, between the mind that perceives most clearly the advantages of existing institutions and the possible dangers of change and that which sees most keenly the defects of existing institutions and the vast additions that may be made to human well-being, form in all large classes of men opposite biases which find their expression in party divisions. The one side rests chiefly on the great truth that one of the first conditions of good government is essential stability, and on the extreme danger of a nation cutting itself off from the traditions of its past, denuding its government of all moral support, and perpetually tampering with the main pillars of the State. The other side rests chiefly upon the no less certain truths that government is an organic thing, that it must be capable of growing, expanding, and adapting itself to new conditions of thought or of society ; that it is subject to grave diseases, which can only be arrested by a constant vigilance, and that its attributes and functions are susceptible of almost infinite variety and extension with the new and various developments of national life. The one side represents the statical, the other the dynamical element in politics. Each can claim for itself a natural affinity to some of the highest qualities of mind and character, and each, perhaps, owes quite as much of

its strength to mental and moral disease. Stupidity is naturally Tory. The large classes who are blindly wedded to routine, and are simply incapable of understanding or appreciating new ideas, or the exigencies of changed circumstances, or the conditions of a reformed society, find their natural place in the Tory ranks. Folly, on the other hand, is naturally Liberal. To this side belongs the cast of mind which, having no sense of the infinite complexity and interdependence of political problems, of the part which habit, association, and tradition play in every healthy political organism, and of the multifarious remote and indirect consequences of every institution, is prepared with a light heart and a reckless hand to recast the whole framework of the constitution in the interest of speculation or experiment. The colossal weight of national selfishness gravitates naturally to Toryism. That party rallies round its banner the great multitude who, having made their position, desire merely to keep things as they are, who are prepared to subordinate their whole policy to the maintenance of class privileges, who look with cold hearts and apathetic minds on the vast mass of remediable misery and injustice around them, who have never made a serious effort, or perhaps conceived a serious desire, to leave the world in any respect a better place than they found it. Even in the case of reforms which have no natural connection with party politics, and which, by diverting attention from other changes, would be eminently beneficial to the Tories, that party has usually been less efficient than its rival, because its leaders were paralysed by the atmosphere of selfishness pervading their ranks, and because most of the reforming and energetic intellects were ranged among their opponents. On the other hand, the acrid humours and more turbulent passions of society flow strongly in the Liberal direction. Envy, which hates every privilege or dignity it does not share, is in-

tensely democratic, and disordered ambitions and dishonest adventurers find their natural place in the party of progress and of change.

The Whig Governments, from the accession of George I. to the death of Henry Pelham, only exhibited in a very subdued and diluted form both the virtues and the vices of Liberalism ; and though this period is very important in the history of English politics, its importance lies much more in the silent and almost insensible growth of parliamentary government than in distinct remedial measures. The measures of reform that were actually passed were usually such as were almost imperatively demanded by critical circumstances, or by the growth of some great evil in the nation. Some of them were of great importance. The rebellion of 1745 made it absolutely necessary to put an end to the anarchy of the Highlands, and to the almost complete independence which enabled the Highland chief to defy the law, and to rally around him in a few days, and in any cause, a considerable body of armed men. The Acts for the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions, for disarming the Highlanders, and for depriving them of their national dress, were carried with this object, and the first, which made the English law supreme throughout the island, has, as we shall see in another chapter, proved one of the most important measures in Scotch history, the chief cause of the rapid progress of Scotland in wealth and civilisation.

Another measure of the Pelham ministry was intended to check a still graver evil than Highland anarchy. The habit of gin-drinking—the master curse of English life, to which most of the crime and an immense proportion of the misery of the nation may be ascribed—if it did not absolutely originate, at least became for the first time a national vice, in the early Hanoverian period. Drunkenness, it is true, had long been common, though

Camden maintained that in his day it was still a recent vice, that there had been a time when the English were 'of all the northern nations the most commended for their sobriety,' and that 'they first learnt in their wars in the Netherlands to drown themselves with immoderate drinking.'¹ The Dutch and German origin of many drinking terms lends some colour to this assertion, and it is corroborated by other evidence. 'Superfluity of drink,' wrote Tom Nash in the reign of Elizabeth, 'is a sin that ever since we have mixed ourselves with the Low Countries is counted honourable; but, before we knew their lingering wars, was held in the highest degree of hatred that might be.' 'As the English,' said Chamberlayne, 'returning from the wars in the Holy Land brought home the foul disease of leprosy . . . so in our fathers' days the English returning from the service in the Netherlands brought with them the foul vice of drunkenness.' But the evil, if it was not indigenous in England,² at least spread very rapidly and very widely. 'In England,' said Iago, 'they are most potent in potting. Your Dane, your German, and your swag-bellied Hollander are nothing to your English.'³ 'We seem,' wrote a somewhat rhetorical writer in 1657, 'to be steeped in liquors, or to be the dizzy island. We drink as if we were nothing but sponges . . . or had tunnels in our mouths. . . . We are the grape-suckers of the earth.'⁴

The dissipated habits of the Restoration, and especially the growing custom of drinking toasts, greatly increased the evil, but it was noticed that the introduction of coffee, which spread widely through Eng-

¹ Camden's *Hist. of Elizabeth*, A.D. 1581.

² See the early history of English drinking, in Disraeli's *Cu-ri-osi-ties of Literature; Drinking Customs in England*; and Mal-

colm's *Manners and Customs of London*, i. 285-289.

³ *Othello*, act ii. scene iii.

⁴ Reeve's 'Plea for Nineveh,' quoted in Malcolm's *Manners and Customs of London*, i. 286.

land in the last years of the seventeenth century, had a perceptible influence in diminishing it,¹ and among the upper classes drunkenness was, perhaps, never quite so general as between the time of Elizabeth and the Revolution. French wines were the favourite drink, but the War of the Revolution for a time almost excluded them, and the Methuen Treaty of 1703, which admitted the wines of Portugal at a duty of one-third less than those of France, gradually produced a complete change in the national taste. This change was, however, not fully accomplished for nearly a century, and it was remarked that in the reign of Anne the desire to obtain French wines at a reasonable rate greatly strengthened the opposition to Marlborough and the war.² The amount of hard drinking among the upper classes was still very great, and it is remarkable how many of the most conspicuous characters were addicted to it. Addison, the foremost moralist of his time, was not free from it.³ Oxford, whose private character was in most respects singularly high, is said to have come, not unfrequently, drunk into the very presence of the Queen.⁴ Bolingbroke, when in office, sat up whole nights drinking, and in the morning, having bound a wet napkin round his forehead and his eyes, to drive away the effects of his intemperance, he hastened, without sleep, to his official business.⁵ When Walpole was a young man his father was accustomed

¹ Chamberlayne. See, too, a curious testimony on this subject quoted in Jesse's *London*, iii. 250.

² Cunningham's *Hist.* ii. 200, 201. Dr. Radcliffe is said to have ascribed much of the sickness of the time to the want of French wines. See, too, on the history of French wines, Craik's *Hist.*

of Commerce, ii. 165, 166, 180, 181. Davenant's *Report to the Commissioners for Stating the Public Accounts*.

³ Spence. Swift's *Correspondence*.

⁴ E. Lewis to Swift.

⁵ Mrs. Delany's *Correspondence*, vi. 168.

to pour into his glass a double portion of wine, saying, 'Come, Robert, you shall drink twice while I drink once; for I will not permit the son in his sober senses to be witness of the intoxication of his father.' This education produced its natural fruits, and the entertainments of the minister at Houghton were the scandal of his county, and often drove Lord Townshend from his neighbouring seat of Rainham.¹ The brilliant intellect of Carteret was clouded by drink,² and even Pulteney, who appears in his later years to have had stronger religious convictions than any other politician of his time, is said to have shortened his life by the same means.³

Among the poor, however, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, the popular beverage was still beer or ale, the use of which—especially before the art of noxious adulteration was brought to its present perfection—has always been more common than the abuse. The consumption appears to have been amazing. It was computed in 1688 that no less than 12,400,000 barrels were brewed in England in a single year, though the entire population probably little exceeded 5,000,000. In 1695, with a somewhat heavier excise, it sank to 11,350,000 barrels, but even then almost a third part of the arable land of the kingdom was devoted to barley.⁴ Under Charles I. a company was formed with the sole right of making spirits and vinegar in the cities of London and Westminster and within twenty-one miles of the same,

¹ Coxe's *Walpole*, i. 5, 758, 759.

² Chesterfield's *Characters*.

³ Speaker Onslow's Remarks (Coxe's *Walpole*, ii. 559).

⁴ Gregory King's *State of England*, pp. 55, 56. In an edition of Chamberlayne's *Magna Britannia Notitia*, published in 1710, it is stated that in 1667, when the greater part of London was in ashes after the Fire, and many

of the inhabitants were forced to retire to the country, no less than 1,522,781 barrels of beer and ale were brewed in the City, each of them containing from 32 to 36 gallons, that the amount brewed annually in London had since risen to near two millions of barrels, and that the excise for London was farmed out for 120,000*l.* a year (p. 219).

but this measure had little fruit; the British distilleries up to the time of the Revolution were quite inconsiderable, and the brandies which were imported in large quantities from France were much too expensive to become popular. Partly, however, through hostility to France, and partly in order to encourage the home distilleries, the Government of the Revolution, in 1689, absolutely prohibited the importation of spirits from all foreign countries,¹ and threw open the trade of distillery, on the payment of certain duties, to all its subjects.² These measures laid the foundation of the great extension of the English manufacture of spirits, but it was not till about 1724 that the passion for gin-drinking appears to have infected the masses of the population, and it spread with the rapidity and the violence of an epidemic. Small as is the place which this fact occupies in English history, it was probably, if we consider all the consequences that have flowed from it, the most momentous in that of the eighteenth century—incomparably more so than any event in the purely political or military annals of the country. The fatal passion for drink was at once, and irrevocably, planted in the nation. The average of British spirits distilled, which is said to have been only 527,000 gallons in 1684, and 2,000,000 in 1714, had risen in 1727 to 3,601,000, and in 1735 to 5,394,000 gallons. Physicians declared that in excessive gin-drinking a new and terrible source of mortality had been opened for the poor. The grand jury of Middlesex, in a powerful presentment, declared that much the greater part of the poverty, the murders, the robberies of London, might be traced to this single cause. Retailers of gin were accustomed to hang out painted boards announcing that their customers could be made drunk for a penny, and dead drunk for two-

¹ *Parl. Hist.* xii. 1212.

² *Ibid.* xii. 1211-1214. Mac-

pherson's *Annals of Commerce*, ii. 639.

pence, and should have straw for nothing; and cellars strewn with straw were accordingly provided, into which those who had become insensible were dragged, and where they remained till they had sufficiently recovered to renew their orgies.

The evil acquired such frightful dimensions that even the unreforming Parliament of Walpole perceived the necessity of taking strong measures to arrest it, and in 1736 Sir J. Jekyll brought in and carried a measure, to which Walpole reluctantly assented, imposing a duty of 20s. a gallon on all spirituous liquors, and prohibiting any person from selling them in less quantities than two gallons without paying a tax of 50*l.* a year.¹ Such a scale, if it could have been maintained, would have almost amounted to prohibition, but the passion for these liquors was now too widely spread to be arrested by law. Violent riots ensued. In 1737, it is true, the consumption sank to about 3,600,000 gallons, but, as Walpole had predicted, a clandestine retail trade soon sprang up, which being at once very lucrative and very popular, increased to such an extent that it was found impossible to restrain it. In 1742 more than 7,000,000 gallons were distilled, and the consumption was steadily augmenting. The measure of 1736 being plainly inoperative, an attempt was made in 1743 to suppress the clandestine trade, and at the same time to increase the public revenue, by a Bill lowering the duty on most kinds of spirits to 1*d.* in the gallon, levied at the still-head, and at the same time reducing the price of retail licences from 50*l.* to 20*s.*² The Bill was carried in spite of the strenuous opposition of Chesterfield, Lord Hervev, and the whole bench of Bishops, and, while it did nothing to discourage drunkenness, it appears to have had little or no effect upon smuggling. In 1749 more

¹ 9 Geo. II. c. 23.

² 16 Geo. II. c. 8.

than 4,000 persons were convicted of selling spirituous liquors without a licence, and the number of the private gin-shops within the Bills of Mortality was estimated at more than 17,000. At the same time crime and immorality of every description were rapidly increasing. The City of London urgently petitioned for new measures of restriction. The London physicians stated in 1750 that there were, in or about the metropolis, no less than 14,000 cases of illness, most of them beyond the reach of medicine, directly attributable to gin. Fielding, in his well-known pamphlet 'On the late Increase of Robbers,' which was published in 1751, ascribed that evil, in a great degree, 'to a new kind of drunkenness, unknown to our ancestors;' he declared that gin was 'the principal sustenance (if it may be so called) of more than 100,000 people in the metropolis,' and he predicted that, 'should the drinking of this poison be continued at its present height during the next twenty years, there will, by that time, be very few of the common people left to drink it.' It was computed that, in 1750 and 1751, more than 11 millions of gallons of spirits were annually consumed, and the increase of population, especially in London, appears to have been perceptibly checked. Bishop Benson, in a letter written from London a little later, said 'there is not only no safety of living in this town, but scarcely any in the country now, robbery and murder are grown so frequent. Our people are now become what they never before were, cruel and inhuman. Those accursed spirituous liquors, which, to the shame of our Government, are so easily to be had, and in such quantities drunk, have changed the very nature of our people; and they will, if continued to be drunk, destroy the very race of people themselves.'¹

¹ Fraser's *Life of Berkeley*, pp. 332, 333.

In 1751, however, some new and stringent measures were carried under the Pelham ministry, which had a real and very considerable effect. Distillers were prohibited under a penalty of 10*l.* from either retailing spirituous liquors themselves, or selling them to unlicensed retailers. Debts contracted for liquors not amounting to twenty shillings at a time were made irrecoverable by law. Retail licences were conceded only to 10*l.* householders within the Bills of Mortality, and to traders who were subject to certain parochial rates without them, and the penalties for unlicensed retailing were greatly increased. For the second offence, the clandestine dealer was liable to three months' imprisonment and to whipping; for the third offence he incurred the penalty of transportation.¹ Two years later another useful law was carried restricting the liberty of magistrates in issuing licences, and subjecting public-houses to severe regulations.² Though much less ambitious than the Act of 1736, these measures were far more efficacious, and they form a striking instance of the manner in which legislation, if not over-strained or ill-timed, can improve the morals of a people. Among other consequences of the Acts it may be observed that dropsy, which had risen in London to a wholly unprecedented point between 1718 and 1751, immediately diminished, and the diminution was ascribed by physicians to the marked decrease of drunkenness in the community.³ Still these measures formed a palliation and not a cure, and from the early years of the eighteenth century gin-drinking has never ceased to be the main counteracting influence to the moral, intellectual, and physical benefits that might be

¹ 24 Geo. II. c. 40.

² 26 Geo. II. c. 13.

³ Heberden's *Observations on*

the Increase and Decrease of different Diseases (1801), p. 45.

expected from increased commercial prosperity. Of all the pictures of Hogarth none are more impressive than those in which he represents the different conditions of a people whose national beverage is beer and of a people who are addicted to gin, and the contrast exhibits in its most unfavourable aspect the difference between the Hanoverian period and that which preceded it.¹

Something also was done to secure the maintenance of order, but there was still very much to be desired. The impunity with which outrages were committed in the ill-lit and ill-guarded streets of London during the first half of the eighteenth century can now hardly be realised. In 1712 a club of young men of the higher classes, who assumed the name of Mohocks, were accustomed nightly to sally out drunk into the streets to hunt the passers-by and to subject them in mere wantonness to the most atrocious outrages. One of their favourite amusements, called 'tipping the lion,' was to squeeze the nose of their victim flat upon his face and to bore out his eyes with their fingers. Among them were the 'sweaters,' who formed a circle round their prisoner and pricked him with their swords till he sank exhausted to the ground, the 'dancing masters,' so called from their skill in making men caper by thrusting swords into their legs, the 'tumblers,' whose favourite amusement was to set women on their heads and commit various indecencies and barbarities on the limbs that were exposed. Maid-servants as they opened their masters' doors were waylaid, beaten, and their faces cut. Matrons

¹ See on this subject the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1751, pp. 136, 282, 283, 321, 322; 1760, pp. 18-22. Short's *Hist. of the Increase and Decrease of Mankind in England*, p. 21. Coxe's *Life of Pelham*, ii. 182. Maty's *Life of*

Chesterfield, p. 209. Walpole's *George II.* i. 66, 67. Smollett's *Hist.* Fielding's *Increase of Robbers*. Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees*, Remark G. *Parl. Debates*.

inclosed in barrels were rolled down the steep and stony incline of Snow Hill. Watchmen were unmercifully beaten and their noses slit. Country gentlemen went to the theatre as if in time of war, accompanied by their armed retainers. A bishop's son was said to be one of the gang, and a baronet was among those who were arrested.¹ This atrocious fashion passed away, but other, though comparatively harmless, rioters were long accustomed to beat the watch, to break the citizens' windows, and to insult the passers-by, while robberies multiplied to a fearful extent. Long after the Revolution, the policy of the Government was to rely mainly upon informers for the repression of crime, but the large rewards that were offered were in a great degree neutralised by the popular feeling against the class.

The watchmen or constables were usually inefficient; they were to be found much more frequently in beer-shops than in the streets, and they were often themselves a serious danger to the community. Fielding, who knew them well, has left a graphic description of one class. 'They were chosen out of those poor decrepit people who are, from their want of bodily strength, rendered incapable of getting a livelihood by work. These men, armed only with a pole, which some of them are scarcely able to lift, are to secure the persons and houses of his Majesty's subjects from the attacks of gangs of young, bold, desperate, and well-armed villains. If the poor old fellows should run away, no one, I think, can wonder, unless it be that they were able to make their escape.'² Of others an opinion may be formed from an incident related by Horace Walpole in 1742. 'A parcel of drunken constables took it into their heads to put the laws in execution against disorderly persons,

¹ Swift's *Journal to Stella*. pp. 324, 335, 347.

Gay's *Trivia*. *The Spectator*, ² *Amelia*, bk. i. ch. ii.

and so took up every woman they met, till they had collected five or six and twenty, all of whom they thrust into St. Martin's roundhouse, where they kept them all night, with doors and windows closed. The poor creatures, who could not stir or breathe, screamed as long as they had any breath left, begging at least for water . . . but in vain. . . . In the morning four were found stifled to death, two died soon after, and a dozen more are in a shocking way. . . . Several of them were beggars, who, from having no lodging, were necessarily found in the street, and others honest labouring women. One of the dead was a poor washerwoman, big with child, who was retiring home late from washing. One of the constables is taken, and others absconded; but I question if any of them will suffer death, though the greatest criminals in this town are the officers of justice; there is no tyranny they do not exercise, no villany of which they do not partake.'¹ The magistrates were in many cases not only notoriously ignorant and inefficient, but also what was termed 'trading justices,' men of whom Fielding said that 'they were never indifferent in a cause but when they could get nothing on either side.'² The daring and the number of robbers increased till London hardly resembled a civilised town. 'Thieves and robbers,' said Smollett, speaking of 1730, 'were now become more desperate and savage than they had ever appeared since mankind were civilised.'³ The Mayor and Aldermen of London in 1744 drew up an address to the King, in which they stated that 'divers confederacies of great numbers of evil-disposed persons, armed with bludgeons, pistols, cutlasses, and other dan-

¹ To Sir H. Mann, July 1742.

² See his picture of Justice Thrasher, in *Amelia*, and his sketch of Justice Squeezum, in *The Coffee-house Politician*.

See, too, Lawrence's *Life of Fielding*, pp. 236-239, and Harris's *Life of Hardwicke*, i. 390, 391.

³ *Hist. of England*.

gerous weapons, infest not only the private lanes and passages, but likewise the public streets and places of usual concourse, and commit most daring outrages upon the persons of your Majesty's good subjects whose affairs oblige them to pass through the streets, by robbing and wounding them, and these acts are frequently perpetrated at such times as were heretofore deemed hours of security.'¹ The same complaints were echoed in the same year in the 'Proposals of the Justices of the Peace for Suppressing Street Robberies,' and the magistrates who drew them up specially noticed, and ascribed to the use of spirituous liquors, 'the cruelties which are now exercised on the persons robbed, which before the excessive use of these liquors were unknown in this nation.'² They recommended an extension of the system of rewards, the suppression or restriction of gaming-houses, public gardens, fairs, and gin-shops, and also measures for systematically drafting into the army and navy suspected and dangerous persons against whom no positive crime could be proved.

The evil, however, appears to have continued. 'One is forced to travel,' wrote Horace Walpole in 1751, 'even at noon as if one were going to battle.'³ The punishments were atrocious and atrociously executed, but they fell chiefly on the more insignificant and inexperienced offenders. On a single morning no less than seventeen persons were executed in London.⁴ One gang of robbers in 1753 kept the whole city in alarm from the number and skill of their robberies and the savage wounds they inflicted on their victims. A recompense of 100*l.* was offered for the apprehension of each of them, but it schief effect was to encourage men who delibe-

¹ Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, p. 230.

² Harris's *Life of Hardwicke*, ii. 97-99.

³ To Sir H. Mann. March 23, 1752.

⁴ *Ibid.*

rately decoyed poor and unwary wretches into robbery in order that by informing against them they might obtain the reward.¹ The more experienced robbers for a time completely overawed the authorities. ‘Officers of justice,’ wrote Fielding, ‘have owned to me that they have passed by such, with warrants in their pockets against them, without daring to apprehend them; and, indeed, they could not be blamed for not exposing themselves to sure destruction; for it is a melancholy truth that at this very day a rogue no sooner gives the alarm within certain purlieus than twenty or thirty armed villains are found ready to come to his assistance.’² When the eighteenth century had far advanced, robbers for whose apprehension large rewards were offered have been known to ride publicly and unmolested, before dusk, in the streets of London, surrounded by their armed adherents, through the midst of a half-terrified, half-curious crowd.³

This state of things was very alarming, and the evil was apparently growing, though some real measures had been taken to improve the security of London. One very important step in this direction was accomplished under George I. The districts of Whitefriars and the Savoy had for centuries the privilege of sheltering debtors against their creditors, and they had become the citadels of the worst characters in the community, who defied the officers of justice and were a perpetual danger to the surrounding districts. In 1697 a law had been passed annulling their franchises; but similar privileges, though not legally recognised, were claimed for the Mint in Southwark, and for many years were successfully maintained. Multitudes of debtors, and

¹ Sir John Fielding’s *Account of the Origin and Effects of a Police set on foot in 1753.*

² *Causes of the Increase of*

Robbers.

³ See an extraordinary instance of this in Andrews’ *Eighteenth Century*, p. 235.

with them great numbers of more serious criminals, fled to this quarter. The attempts of the officers to arrest them were resisted by open violence. Every kind of crime was concocted with impunity, and every conspirator knew where to look for daring and perfectly unscrupulous agents. It was not until 1723 that the Government ventured to grapple firmly with this great evil. An Act making it felony to obstruct the execution of a writ, and enabling the Sheriff of Surrey to raise a *posse comitatus* for taking by force debtors from the Mint, finally removed this plague-spot from the metropolis, and put an end for ever in England to that right of sanctuary which had for many generations been one of the most serious obstructions to the empire of the law.¹

Another and still more important step was the measure which was carried in 1736 for the proper lighting of the streets. Up to this date London was probably in this respect behind every other great city in Europe. The lighting was done by contract, and the contractors, by a singular arrangement, agreed to pay the City 600*l.* a year for their monopoly. In return for this they were empowered to levy a rate of 6*s.* a year from all housekeepers who paid poor rate, and from all who had houses of over 10*l.* per annum, unless they hung out a lantern or candle before their doors, in which case they were exempt from paying for the public lamps. The contractors were bound to place a light before every tenth house, but only from Michaelmas to Lady Day, and then only until midnight, and only on what were termed 'dark nights.' The 'light nights' were ten every month from the sixth after the new moon till the third after the full moon. The system was introduced at the end of the reign of Charles II.,

¹ Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 127, 128.

and was then a great improvement, but it left the streets of London absolutely unlighted for far more than half the hours of darkness. Under such conditions the suppression of crime was impossible, and few measures enacted during the eighteenth century contributed more to the safety of the metropolis than that which was passed in 1736 enabling the Lord Mayor and Aldermen to erect glass lamps in sufficient numbers throughout London, to keep them lighted from the setting to the rising of the sun, and to levy a considerable and general rate for their maintenance. More than 15,000 lamps are said in a few years to have been erected, and it was calculated that, while under the old system London was only lit by public lamps for about 750 hours in the year, under the new system it was lighted for about 5,000.¹

Yet, in spite of this great change, street robberies continued for some years to increase, and the inefficiency of the watchmen, and the great multiplication of the criminal classes under the influence of gin, were constant subjects of complaint. The great novelist Fielding, when driven by narrowed circumstances to accept the office of Bow Street magistrate, did much both to call attention to and to remedy the evil. Under the direction of the Duke of Newcastle, he and his brother, who succeeded him in his post, instituted a new police, consisting of picked men who had been constables, and who were placed under the direct control of the Bow Street magistrates. A very remarkable success rewarded their labours. The gang which had so long terrified London was broken up; nearly all its members were executed, and the change effected was so great that Browne, writing in 1757, was able to say that 'the reigning evil of street robberies has been almost wholly suppressed.'² At the same time a serious attempt was

¹ Maitland's *Hist. of London*, i. 565-567.

² Browne's *Estimate*, i. 219.

made, at once to remove the seeds and sources of crime, and to provide a large reserve for the navy, by collecting many hundreds of the destitute boys who swarmed in the streets, clothing them by public subscription, and drafting them into ships of war, where they were educated as sailors.¹ The police force soon became again very inefficient, but the condition of London does not appear to have been at any subsequent period quite as bad as in the first half of the eighteenth century, though the country highways were still infested with robbers. The early Hanoverian period has, indeed, probably contributed as much as any other portion of English history to the romance of crime. The famous burglar, John Sheppard, after two marvellous escapes from Newgate, which made him the idol of the populace, was at last hanged in 1724. The famous thief-taker, Jonathan Wild, after a long career of crime, being at last convicted of returning stolen goods to the rightful owner without prosecuting the thieves, which had lately been made a capital offence,² was executed in the following year, and was soon after made the subject of a romance by Fielding. The famous highwayman, Dick Turpin, was executed in 1739. Another well-known highwayman named M'Lean is said to have been the son of an Irish Dean and a brother of a Calvinist minister in great esteem at the Hague. He had a lodging in St. James's Street; his manners were those of a polished gentleman, and the interest he excited was so great that the day before his execution in 1750 3,000 persons are said to have visited his cell.³ The

¹ Sir John Fielding *On the Police of 1753*.

² The goods were stolen, and as soon as a reward was offered restored by a confederate.

³ Horace Walpole to Mann. Aug. 1750. Walpole had himself

been robbed by M'Lean in Hyde Park. See, too, his paper in the *World*, No. 103. Some curious particulars of the crime of this period will be found in Harris's *Life of Hardwicke*.

weakness of the law was also shown in the great number of serious riots which took place in every part of the kingdom. The Porteous riots and the riots against the malt tax in Scotland, the Spitalfields riots directed against Irish weavers, and the numerous riots occasioned by the Gin Act, and at a later period by the system of turnpikes and by the preaching of the Methodists, were the most remarkable, while the characteristic English hatred of foreigners was shown by a furious disturbance in 1738 because French actors were employed at the Haymarket, and some years afterwards by the sacking of Drury Lane Theatre because Garrick had employed in a spectacle some French dancers. Outrages connected with smuggling were in many parts of the kingdom singularly daring and ferocious, and they were often countenanced by a large amount of popular sympathy.¹ In Hampshire a gang of deer-stealers, known as the Waltham Blacks, were in the reign of George I. so numerous and so audacious, that a special and most sanguinary law, known as the 'Black Act,' was found necessary for their suppression.²

Another crime, strikingly indicative of the imperfect civilisation of the country, was the plunder of shipwrecked sailors, who were often lured by false signals upon the rocks. In some of the northern countries of Europe, till a comparatively recent period, the law expressly permitted the inhabitants to seize, as a prize, any property that was wrecked upon their coast.³ In England, without any such permission, it became a prevalent custom. At the close of the seventeenth century Defoe mentions that many Englishmen had been sacrificed abroad in resentment for these barbarities, and he tells us how, when a ship of which he

¹ See Pike's *Hist. of Crime*, ii. White's *Selborne*, pp. 29, 30.
399, 652.

³ Blackstone, bk. i. ch. viii.

² 9 George I. c. 22. See § 2.

was himself a shareholder was sinking on the coast of Biscay, a Spanish ship refused to give any assistance, the captain declaring, 'that, having been shipwrecked somewhere on the coast of England, the people, instead of saving him and his ship, came off and robbed him, tore the ship almost to pieces, and left him and his men to swim ashore for their lives while they plundered the cargo; upon which he and his whole crew had sworn never to help an Englishman in whatever distress he should find them, whether at sea or on shore.'¹ About the middle of the eighteenth century the crime increased to an enormous degree on many parts of the British coast.² In order to check it a law had been passed in the reign of Anne and made perpetual under George I., making it felony, without the benefit of clergy, to do any act by which a ship was destroyed, fining anyone who secreted shipwrecked goods treble their value, and enabling the authorities in every seaport town to take special measures for the relief of ships in distress, and in case of success to exact a certain sum from the owners as salvage.³ It was ordered that this Act should be read four times yearly in all the parish churches and chapels of all seaport towns in the kingdom.⁴ It proved, however, utterly insufficient, and in the administration of Pelham the plunder of a shipwrecked or distressed vessel was made a capital offence.⁵ Notwithstanding this enactment, however, the crime was by no means suppressed. It was the especial scandal of Cornwall. In visiting that county in 1776, Wesley learnt that it was still as common there as ever; he severely censured the connivance or indifference of the gentry, who might have totally

¹ Wilson's *Life of Defoe*, i. 209.

² Coxe's *Life of Pelham*, ii. 272.

³ 12 Anne stat. 2, c. 18;

⁴ George I. c. 12.

¹ Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 39-41.

⁵ 26 George II. c. 19.

suppressed it,¹ and he also found the custom very general on the western coast of Ireland.²

The long list of social reforms passed under the Pelham Ministry may be fitly closed by the Marriage Act of Lord Hardwicke, which put a stop to those Fleet marriages which had become one of the strangest scandals of English life. Before this Act, the canon law was in force in England, and according to its provisions the mere consent of the parties, followed by cohabitation, constituted, for many purposes, a valid marriage; and a marriage valid for all purposes could be celebrated by a priest in orders at any time or place, without registration and without the consent of parents or guardians. Stamped licences were indeed required by law, but not for the validity of the contract, and their omission was only punished as a fraud upon the revenue. In such a state of the law atrocious abuses had grown up. A multitude of clergymen, usually prisoners for debt and almost always men of notoriously infamous lives, made it their business to celebrate clandestine marriages in or near the Fleet. They performed the ceremony without licence or question, sometimes without even knowing the names of the persons they united, in public-houses, brothels, or garrets. They acknowledged no ecclesiastical superior. Almost every tavern or brandy shop in the neighbourhood had a Fleet parson in its pay. Notices were placed in the windows, and agents went out in every direction to solicit the passers-by. A more pretentious, and perhaps more popular, establishment was the Chapel

¹ Wesley's *Journal*, Aug. 1776.

² 'A Swedish ship being leaky put into one of our harbours. The Irish, according to custom, ran to plunder her. A neighbouring gentleman hindered

them; and for so doing demanded a fourth part of the cargo. And this, they said, the law allows.'—Wesley's *Journal*, June 1760.

in Curzon Street, where the Rev. Alexander Keith officiated. He was said to have made a 'very bishopric of revenue' by clandestine marriages, and the expression can hardly be exaggerated if it be true, as was asserted in Parliament, that he had married on an average 6,000 couples every year. He himself stated that he had married many thousands, the great majority of whom had not known each other more than a week, and many only a day or half a day. Young and inexperienced heirs fresh from college, or even from school, were thus continually entrapped. A passing frolic, the excitement of drink, an almost momentary passion, the deception or intimidation of a few unprincipled confederates, were often sufficient to drive or inveigle them into sudden marriages, which blasted all the prospects of their lives. In some cases, when men slept off a drunken fit, they heard to their astonishment that, during its continuance, they had gone through the ceremony. When a fleet came in and the sailors flocked on shore to spend their pay in drink and among prostitutes, they were speedily beleaguered, and 200 or 300 marriages constantly took place within a week. Among the more noted instances of clandestine marriages we find that of the Duke of Hamilton with Miss Gunning, that of the Duke of Kingston with Miss Chudleigh, that of Henry Fox with the daughter of the Duke of Richmond, that of the poet Churchill, who at the age of seventeen entered into a marriage which contributed largely to the unhappiness of his life. The state of the law seemed, indeed, ingeniously calculated to promote both the misery and the immorality of the people, for while there was every facility for contracting the most inconsiderate marriages, divorce, except by a special Act of Parliament, was absolutely unattainable. It is not surprising that contracts so lightly entered into should have been as lightly violated. Desertion, con-

jugal infidelity, bigamy, fictitious marriages celebrated by sham priests, were the natural and frequent consequences of the system. In many cases in the Fleet registers names were suppressed or falsified, and marriages fraudulently antedated, and many households, after years of peace, were convulsed by some alleged pre-contract or clandestine tie. It was proved before Parliament that on one occasion there had been 2,954 Fleet marriages in four months, and it appeared from the memorandum-books of Fleet parsons that one of them made 57*l.* in marriage fees in a single month, that another had married 173 couples in a single day.

The evil was of considerable standing, and some attempts had been made to remedy it. By a law of William III. any clergyman celebrating a marriage without licence was subject to a fine of 100*l.*,¹ but this penalty was not renewed at each violation of the Act, and the offender was able by a writ of error to obtain a delay of about a year and a half, during which time he carried on his profession without molestation, made at least 400*l.* or 500*l.*, and then frequently absconded. No penalty whatever attached to the public-house keeper, who hired the clergyman, and in whose house the ceremony was performed. Another Act, passed in 1712, after reciting the loss the revenue experienced from these practices, raised the penalty incurred by the priest to imprisonment, but this also it was found possible to evade. To meet the evil it was necessary to remodel the whole marriage law. The first step in this direction was taken by Lord Bath, who, when attending a Scotch trial, was struck by the hardship of a case in which a man, after a marriage of thirty years, was claimed by another woman on the ground of a pre-contract; but the preparation of a measure on the sub-

¹ 6 & 7 William III. c. 6; 7 & 8 William III. c. 35.

ject soon passed into the hands of the Chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, who succeeded, in 1753, in carrying it successfully through Parliament. His Act provided that, with the exception of Jewish and Quaker marriages, no marriage should be valid in England which was not celebrated by a priest in orders, and according to the Anglican liturgy, that the ceremony could not be performed unless the banns had been published for three successive Sundays in the parish church, or unless a licence had been procured, and that these licences in the cases of minors should be conditional upon the consent of the parents or guardians. The special licence by which alone the marriage could be celebrated in any other place than the parish church, could only be issued by the Archbishop, and cost a considerable sum. All marriages which did not conform to these provisions were null, and all who celebrated them were liable to transportation.¹

This measure is extremely important, as introducing into English legislation a principle which has even now by no means attained its full recognition, but which is evidently destined to become one day supreme. According to the theological theory which was adopted by the law of England, and was long absolute in Christendom, the Church alone has a right to determine what constitutes the validity of a marriage, and when that marriage is once consummated it is absolutely indissoluble, and possesses a mystical sanctity altogether irrespective of its influence upon society. In opposition to this view there has grown up in the last century a conviction that it is not the business of the State to enforce morals, and especially any particular theological conceptions of duty, that its sole end should be to increase the temporal happiness of the people, and that

¹ 26 George II. c. 33.

the restrictions it imposes on individual liberty can only be justified, and should be strictly limited, by this end. According to this view the ecclesiastical and the legal conceptions of marriage are entirely distinct. Marriage should be regarded by the legislator merely as a civil contract of extreme importance to the maintenance of the young, the disposition of property, and the stability of society; and it is the right and the duty of the State, with a sole view to the interests of society, to determine on what conditions it may be celebrated, annulled, or repeated.

In some respects these two views coincide, while in others they conflict. Every statesman will admit that the purity and stability of the marriage state are social ends of great importance, and that a religious sanction contributes to secure them. At the same time the legislator will, in some respects, be more severe, and in others more indulgent, than the divine. Considering marriage as a contract involving momentous civil consequences, he may insist that it should be entered into publicly, formally, and deliberately, may lay down in the interests of society certain restrictive conditions, and may absolutely refuse, when those conditions are not complied with, to recognise its existence, or to punish those who violate or repeat it. On the other hand, in all questions relating to marriages of consanguinity or to divorce, State interference with the liberty of individuals can only be justified on utilitarian grounds. If, for example, the question be that of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, a legislator imbued with this spirit will consider it wholly irrelevant to discuss whether such marriages were or were not forbidden in the Levitical code, whether the Levitical code is binding upon a Christian, whether ecclesiastical tradition favours or condemns them. The sole question for him to decide is whether they produce such a clear preponderance of

social evils as would justify him in restricting in this respect the natural liberty of the subject. If they do not, they should be permitted, and those who regard them as theologically wrong should refrain from contracting them. A similar principle applies to the difficult question of divorce. At first sight nothing can appear more monstrous than that when two persons have voluntarily entered into a contract with the single purpose of promoting their mutual happiness, when they find by experience that the effect of that contract is not happiness but misery, and when they are both of them anxious to dissolve it, the law—whose sole legitimate object is the happiness of the people—should interpose to prevent them from doing so. The presumption against such an interference with individual liberty must always be very weighty, and there are many considerations which tend to strengthen it. Of all forms of wretchedness, that resulting from an unhappy marriage is perhaps the most difficult to anticipate, for it may result from a turn of disposition or an infirmity of temper which is only revealed by the most intimate knowledge. In all ages and countries a vast proportion of these lifelong contracts have either been negotiated by the relations of the contracting parties, with only their nominal consent, or have been entered into at an age when there can be little knowledge of life or character, when the judgment is still unformed, or under the influence of a passion which is proverbially fitted to distort it. It is also a well-recognised fact that, as Swift says, the art of ‘making nets’ is very different from the art of ‘making cages,’ that many of the qualities peculiarly fitted to attract men into marriage are also peculiarly unfitted to secure the happiness of a home. It may be added that while the chances of unhappiness in this contract are so many, that unhappiness may easily rise to an amount of moral misery no

other condition can produce, for it extends to and embitters the minutest details of daily life, pervades every sphere, and depresses every aim. In many cases marriage involves to the weaker party a tyranny so brutal, galling, incessant, and at the same time absolutely hopeless, that it forms the nearest earthly type of eternal damnation. In such cases it would be much more reasonable to speak of the sacrament of divorce than of the sacrament of marriage, and it were hard to say what benefit issues from the contract, unless it be that of relieving death of half its terror by depriving life of all its charm. Thousands of couples who, if freed from the effects of one great mistake, possess all the elements of usefulness and enjoyment, are thus condemned by law to the total sacrifice of the happiness of their lives. Nor are the moral effects less disastrous. No condition can be more fitted to break down and degrade the moral character than that I have described. No condition can present stronger temptations. A moralist may very reasonably doubt whether even open profligacy is more debasing than a legitimate union, in which hatred has taken the place of love, and the unspoken day-dream of each partner is to witness the burial of the other.

It is added that even if the law imposed no restrictions on divorce, perpetual monogamous attachments would always be the most common, for the simple reason that they are those which are most conducive to the happiness of men. They have in their support one of the strongest of all human sentiments—the cohesion of custom. In no other case is this cohesion so powerful, for in no other is the relation so close or so constant. Putting aside the idle cant of satirical writers, every candid observer will admit that the death of a husband or a wife is, usually, without exception the greatest calamity that can befall the survivor. With such a volun-

tary cohesion severance would be very rare unless there were some strong reason to overcome it, and when so strong a reason exists it would probably be advisable. The birth of children, which makes the stability of the family peculiarly necessary, contributes in itself to secure it, for every child joins its parents by a new bond. Nature has abundantly provided for the stability of the marriage state when it promotes happiness. Why should the law prevent its dissolution when it produces pain?

The answer is that these arguments underrate the violence of a passion which is, perhaps, the most dangerous and unruly in human nature, and at the same time neglect to make sufficient allowance for the inequality of the sexes. In the marriage contract the woman is the weaker; she is usually the poorer; her happiness is far more absolutely bound up with her domestic life than the happiness of a man. Her vigour passes before that of her husband. If cast out at a mature age from the domestic circle, her whole life is broken, and the very probability of such a fate is sufficient to embitter it. If divorce could always be effected without delay, difficulty, expense, or blame; if the law provided no protection for the weaker partner against those violent passions which may be conceived by one sex in mature age, and which are rarely inspired by the other except in youth, it is easy to predict what would be the result. The tie of custom would in innumerable cases be snapped by the impulse of passion. Very many would never pass that painful novitiate, when tastes and habits have not yet assimilated, which is now so often the preface to many years of uninterrupted happiness. In many cases the mere decline of physical charms would lead to a severance of the bond. The appetite for change would grow with the means of gratifying it, and thus affections would be weakened,

habits would be unsettled, and insecurity and misery would be widely spread. Nor would the evil stop here. The stability of domestic life is of vital importance to the position, the education, and the moral culture of the young, and to the maintenance among all classes of those steady and settled habits that are most valuable to the community.

It is not necessary in this place to pursue this subject into detail, or to discuss the exact amount of restriction which in these cases can be judiciously imposed. It is plain that the marriage tie is not one of those which the legislator can deal with on the principle of unlimited freedom of contract. It is also, I think, plain that the complete ascendancy in law of the secular view of marriage must sooner or later lead to a greater extension of the liberty of divorce than in England, at least, is admitted. The condemnation of either partner for any of the graver or more degrading forms of criminal offence, and even habits of inveterate and systematic drunkenness, might very reasonably be made legal causes. The question whether the desire of the two contracting parties, who have discovered that the contract into which they had entered is prejudicial to their happiness, should be regarded as a sufficient ground, is a much more difficult one. It is clear, however, that a legislator who accorded such latitude would be perfectly justified in imposing upon both parties such a period of probation or delay as would meet the cases of fickleness or sudden passion, and on the stronger party such special burdens as would to some extent equalise the balance of interest. But his judgment on this matter should be formed solely by an estimate of consequences. He must strike the balance between opposing evils, and his point of view is thus wholly different from that of the theologian who starts with the belief that divorce is in itself necessarily sacrilegious.

This is a matter for the conscience and judgment of individuals, but not for the cognisance of law. In the Marriage Act of Lord Hardwicke the question of divorce was not directly raised, but the modern legal doctrine of marriage was fully established by the clause which treated matrimonial contracts as absolute nullities, though they were celebrated with a regular religious ceremony, if certain legal requirements were wanting. The dissolution of religious marriages for temporal reasons was, indeed, not altogether new in British law. In the Regency Bill, which was passed on the death of the Prince of Wales in 1751, there was a clause annulling any marriage contracted by the young heir to the throne before the expiration of his minority without the consent of the Regent, or of the major part of the Council; and a similar principle was involved in the Irish law annulling marriages between Protestants and Catholics, celebrated by priests or degraded clergymen. The Marriage Act of 1753, however, gave this principle a much greater extension. It was justly noticed as a striking illustration of the decline of dogmatic theology in England that a Bill, involving so important a principle, should have passed without serious difficulty through the House of Lords, and should have been assented to by the whole bench of bishops.¹

In the House of Commons, however, the Marriage Bill was fiercely assailed. Henry Fox, who had himself a very natural predilection for the old system, though a member of the Government, met it with the most determined and acrimonious opposition, and he found a considerable body of supporters. Their arguments will now appear to most men very inconclusive. Much was said on such topics as the natural right of all men to be married as they pleased, the immorality

¹ Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* i. 146, 342.

that would ensue from any measure which rendered marriages difficult, the tendency of the new Bill to increase the despotic power of parents, and the advantages of the old system in assisting younger sons in marrying heiresses, and thus dispersing fortunes which under the law of primogeniture had been unduly accumulated.¹ Such arguments could have no real weight in the face of the glaring and scandalous evils of Fleet marriages, and the law as remodelled by Lord Hardwicke continued in force until the present century. It is evident, however, that the monopoly which the Anglican clergy possessed of celebrating legal marriages could not be accepted by other sects as a final settlement of the question, and as the principle of religious equality became more fully recognised in English politics, a serious and at last successful agitation arose against the Act. There were also some legal flaws in it, which somewhat qualified the admiration with which it was regarded by lawyers.² Such as it was, however, it was effectual in suppressing a great scandal and a great evil which had taken deep root in the habits of the nation. With large classes of the community the easy process of Fleet marriages was very popular. On the day before the new law came into force 300 were celebrated, and a bold attempt was made by a clergyman named Wilkinson to perpetuate the system at the Savoy. He claimed, by virtue of some old privileges attaching to that quarter,

¹ It is curious to observe what nonsense Horace Walpole talked about this Bill, not in a party speech, but in a grave history. He says that it 'seemed to annex as sacred privileges to birth as could be devised in the proudest, poorest little Italian principality,' that it was 'the bane of society, the golden grate that separates

the nobility from the plebeians,' that 'from beginning to end of the Bill one only view had predominated, that of pride and of aristocracy.'—*Memoirs of George II.* i. 336-348, 358.

² See Lord Campbell's severe judgment of it. *Lives of the Chancellors*, vi. 262.

to be extra-parochial, and to have the right of issuing licences himself, and he is said to have actually celebrated as many as 1,400 clandestine marriages after the Marriage Act had passed. By the instrumentality of Garrick, a member of whose company had been married in this manner in 1756, a Savoy licence passed into the hands of the Government, and the trial and transportation of Wilkinson and his curate put an end to clandestine marriages in England. Those who desired them, however, found a refuge in Scotland, the Isle of Man, and Guernsey; and in 1760 there were always vessels ready at Southampton to carry fugitive lovers to the latter island.¹

The measures I have enumerated, though very important, were for the most part remedies applied to some great and crying evils which had at last become intolerable to the community. Of the active reforming and philanthropic spirit which became so conspicuous in the reign of George III. we find at this time scarcely any traces. The creation of the great religious societies, and part of the legislation of William, showed something of this spirit, and something of it appeared, though in a more exclusively ecclesiastical form, during the clerical reaction under Anne, but during the ascendancy of Walpole and the Pelhams it almost wholly died away. The Methodist movement was as yet in its purely religious stage; the Court and Government initiated nothing, and the number of private reformers was very small. The scheme of Berkeley for founding a Christian university in Bermuda for the civilisation and conversion of America was one of the few examples. This extraordinary man, who united the rarest and most various

¹ See J. Southerden Burns' very curious *Hist. of Fleet Marriages*; the copious extracts from the Fleet registers in Knight's

Hist. of London; Pennant's *London*; Smollett's *Hist.*; *Parl. Hist.*; and Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.*

intellectual gifts with a grace and purity of character, and an enthusiasm of benevolence, that fascinated all about him, succeeded for a time in communicating something of his own spirit to some of the most selfish of politicians. The story is well known how his irresistible eloquence turned the ridicule of the Scriblerus Club into a brief but genuine outburst of enthusiasm ; how he raised by subscription a considerable sum for carrying out his scheme, Walpole himself contributing 200*l.* ; how his success in canvassing the Members of Parliament was so great that the Bill for endowing the university passed in 1726 with only two dissentient voices. Walpole was astonished at the success, having, as he said, 'taken it for granted the very preamble of the Bill would have secured its rejection,' but although he promised 20,000*l.* he never paid it, and in 1731 Berkeley, receiving a private intimation that it was hopeless expecting it, was obliged to abandon the enterprise, and returned from Rhode Island to Ireland.

A more successful reformer was James Oglethorpe, a very remarkable man, whose long life of 96 years was crowded with picturesque incidents and with the most various and active benevolence. Having served as a young man under Prince Eugene, he entered Parliament in 1722, and sat there for thirty-three years. Though a man of indomitable energy, and of some practical and organising talent, he had no forensic ability, and he was both too hot-tempered, too impulsive, and too magnanimous to take a high rank among the adroit and intriguing politicians of his time. He would probably have remained an undistinguished Member of Parliament if it had not happened that among his acquaintances was a gentleman named Castell, who, having fallen from a considerable position into hopeless debt, had been imprisoned in the Fleet, and being unable to pay the accustomed fees to the warder, had been con-

fined in a house where the small-pox was raging, and had perished by the disease. This incident directed the attention of Oglethorpe to the management of the prisons. For many years it had been known that debtors in England were subject to frightful privations, and a book had been published as early as 1691 enumerating their wrongs,¹ but no steps had been taken to redress them. Oglethorpe, however, succeeded in 1729 in obtaining a parliamentary inquiry into the condition of the Fleet and the Marshalsea, which was afterwards extended to that of the other gaols, and the results were so horrible that they produced a universal cry of indignation.

It appeared that the wardenship of the Fleet was regularly put up for sale, that it had been bought from the great Lord Clarendon by John Huggins for 5,000*l.*, that it had been sold by Huggins to Bambridge for the same sum in 1728, and that these men were accustomed, in addition to the large regular emoluments of the office, to exact heavy fees from the prisoners, and to avenge themselves upon those who were unable or unwilling to pay them, by the utmost excesses of brutality. In the Fleet, when Bambridge was governor, such prisoners were continually left manacled for long periods in a dungeon, almost unendurable from its stench and its want of ventilation, situated above a common sewer, and in which the bodies of those who died in the prison were deposited to await the coroner's inquest. One brave soldier had been falsely accused of theft, acquitted by the jury, and then seized and imprisoned as a debtor by the gaoler on account of the gaol

¹ See on this subject Muralt's *Letters on the English* (Eng. trans. 1726), p. 69. In 1711 the Irish Convocation ordered a

special form of prayer 'for imprisoned debtors' to be inserted in the Irish Prayer Book. Mant's *Hist. of the Irish Church*, ii. 233.

fees that were incurred during his detention. Cases were proved of debtors who, being unable to pay their fees, were locked up, like Castell, with prisoners suffering from small-pox, and thus rapidly destroyed; of others who were reduced almost to skeletons by insufficient food; of sick women who were left without beds, without attendance, and without proper nourishment, till they died of neglect; of men who were tortured by the thumbscrew, or who lingered in slow agony under irons of intolerable weight. One poor Portuguese had been left for two months in this condition. Another prisoner had lost all memory and all use of his limbs from the sufferings he underwent. Great numbers perished through want of the most ordinary care. It appears, indeed, to have been the deliberate intention of the governor to put an end to some of his prisoners, either because they were unable to pay fees, or because they had for some reason incurred his resentment, or in order that he might obtain the small remnants of their property. In Newgate, and in some of the provincial prisons in England, almost equal atrocities were discovered. In Dublin—where inquiries were instituted with commendable promptitude by the Irish Parliament—it was found that a tax was systematically laid upon each prisoner to provide strong drink for the gaol, that the worst criminals were mingled with the debtors, and that a tyranny not less brutal than that of the Fleet was exercised by the gaoler. One wretched man, crippled by a broken leg, was left for two months in a bed to which the water frequently rose, and which rotted away beneath him.¹

¹ Howell's *State Trials*, xvii. *Parl. Hist.* viii. 708-753. Nichols' *Life of Hogarth*, p. 19. *Historical Register*, 1729. Wright's *Memoirs of Oglethorpe*. Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, pp. 294-298. Mr. Froude (*English in Ireland*,

i. 591, 592) has enumerated many of the atrocities in the Dublin prison. He has *not* mentioned that the inquiry which revealed them was a consequence of the discovery of similar atrocities in the principal prisons of England.

In most large prisons the gaol fever, produced by squalor, overcrowding, bad drainage, insufficient nourishment, and insufficient exercise, made fearful ravages, and sometimes, by a righteous retribution, it spread from these centres through the rest of the community. This evil was already noticed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The 'Black Assize' at Oxford, in 1577, was long remembered, when the Chief Baron, the Sheriff, and about 300 men died within forty hours. Bacon described the gaol fever as 'the most pernicious infection next to the plague, . . . whereof we have had in our time experience twice or thrice, when both the judges that sat upon the jail, and numbers of those who attended the business, or were present, sickened and died.' In 1730 Chief Baron Pengelly, Serjeant Shippen, and many others, were killed by gaol fever when attending the Dorsetshire Assizes, and the High Sheriff of Somersetshire perished through the same cause. In the Scotch rebellion no less than 200 men in a single regiment were infected by some deserters. The army and navy, indeed, through the operation of the press-gang, which seized numbers just released from prison, were peculiarly exposed to the contagion, and it was said by a good judge, that the mortality in them produced by the gaol fever was greater than that produced by all other causes combined. In 1750 the disease raged to such an extent in Newgate that at the Old Bailey Assizes two judges, the Lord Mayor, an alderman, and many of inferior rank were its victims. From that time sweet-smelling herbs were always placed in the prisoners' dock to counteract the contagion.¹

Something was done by new prison regulations, and by the removal and prosecution of some of the worst

¹ Howard *On Prisons*, Introduction. Lawrence's *Life of Fielding*, pp. 296, 297.

offenders, to remedy the evil ; but still the condition of the prisons continued till a much later period a disgrace to English civilisation. The miseries of the imprisoned debtor were commemorated in the poetry of Thomson, and by the pencil of Hogarth, and they furnished the subject of some of the most pathetic pages of Fielding and Smollett. As late as 1741 it was announced that two prisoners had died of extreme want in the Marshalsea in Dublin, and that several others were reduced to the verge of starvation.¹ In 1759 Dr. Johnson computed the number of imprisoned debtors at not less than 20,000,² and asserted that one of four died every year from the treatment they underwent.

The exposure of the abuses in the English prisons by no means exhausted the philanthropic energies of Oglethorpe. Like Berkeley, his imagination was directed towards the West, and he conceived the idea of founding a colony in which poor debtors on attaining their freedom might find a refuge. A charter was obtained in 1732. Private subscriptions flowed largely in, and with the consent of Berkeley the proceeds of the sale of some lands, which Parliament had voted for the Bermuda scheme, were appropriated to the new enterprise. Early in 1733 the colony of Georgia was founded, and Oglethorpe for many years was its governor. Besides giving a refuge to needy classes from England, the colony was intended to exercise a civilising and missionary influence upon the surrounding Indians ; and in its charter Oglethorpe inserted a most memorable clause, absolutely prohibiting the introduction of slaves. Georgia became a centre of the Moravian sect, the scene of the early labours of the Wesleys, and afterwards of White-

¹ *Dublin Gazette*, March 17-21, 1740-41.

² *Idler*, No. 38. Johnson afterwards, in reprinting the *Idler*,

admitted that he had found reasons to question the accuracy of this calculation.

field, and the asylum of many of the poor Protestants who had been driven, on account of their religion, from the bishopric of Salzburg. The administration of Oglethorpe was marred by some faults of temper and of tact, but it was on the whole able, energetic, and fortunate. When hostilities broke out with Spain he conducted the war with brilliant courage and success, and he succeeded in materially diminishing the atrocities which had hitherto accompanied Indian warfare. He became a general and served in the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, but was repulsed with some loss at the village of Clifton; and though acquitted by a court of inquiry, his conduct during this campaign threw a certain shadow over his military reputation. He succeeded, in 1749, in carrying through Parliament a Bill exempting the Moravians in England from the necessity of violating their religious sentiments by taking oaths or bearing arms. He was one of the first men who recognised the rising genius of Johnson: and in his old age he was the intimate friend of Johnson, Goldsmith, and Burke. His singularly varied and useful life terminated in 1785.¹

With these exceptions, probably the only considerable trace of warm and disinterested philanthropy in the sphere of politics during the period I am describing was the vote of 100,000*l.* in 1755 for the relief of the distressed Portuguese, after the great earthquake at Lisbon. In no respect does the legislation of this period present a more striking contrast to that of the nineteenth century than in the almost complete absence of attempts to alleviate the social condition of the poorer

¹ Wright's *Life of Oglethorpe*. See, too, the many allusions to him in Boswell's *Johnson*. H. Walpole always depreciates Oglethorpe. Pope has devoted a well-known couplet to him.

One driven by strong benevolence of
sent
 shall by like Oglethorpe from pole to
 pole.—*Imitation of Horace*, Ep. ii.
 See, too, Wesley's *Journal* and
 Tyerman's *Life of Wesley*.

classes, or to soften the more repulsive features of English life. The public Press had not yet undertaken that minute and searching investigation into abuses, which is the most useful of all its functions; and the general level of humanity in the community was little, if at all, higher than in the preceding generation. The graphic and terrible picture which is given in 'Roderick Random' of the hardships endured by the common sailors on board a man-of-war, was derived from the actual experience of the author, when serving in 1741 as surgeon's mate in the expedition against Carthagena;¹ and those who read it will hardly wonder that it was found impossible in time of war to man the royal navy without having constant recourse to the press-gang.² The condition of the army was little better. It appears from a memorial drawn up in 1707 that the garrison of Portsmouth was reduced by death or desertion to half its former number in less than a year and a half, through sickness, want of firing, and bad barracks, and the few new barracks that were erected were built with the most scandalous parsimony, and crowded to the most frightful excess.³ The African slave trade was still an important branch of British enterprise. A few isolated voices, as

¹ That it is not exaggerated is abundantly shown by Lind's *Essay on the Health of Seamen*, which was first published in 1757. This author says (ch. i.): 'I have known 1,000 men confined together in a guardship, some hundreds of whom had neither a bed nor so much as a change of linen. I have seen many of them brought into hospital in the same clothes and shirts they had on when pressed several months before.'

² Pelham, in 1749, endeavoured to abolish impressment by main-

taining a reserve of 3,000 seamen, who were to receive a pension in time of peace, and to be called into active service in time of war; but the Bill was violently opposed and eventually dropped (Coxe's *Life of Pelham*, ii. 66-70). A somewhat similar measure, but on a larger scale, had actually passed under William, but it was repealed in the ninth year of Anne (Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, ii. 683).

³ Clode's *Military Forces of the Crown*, i. 222.

we shall hereafter see, had been raised against it, but they had as yet made no sensible impression on the public mind, and no less a statesman than the elder Pitt made its development a main object of his policy. The penal code was not only atrociously sanguinary and continually aggravated by the addition of new offences; it was also executed in a manner peculiarly fitted to brutalise the people. In some respects, it is true, it may be compared favourably with the criminal procedures of the Continent. English law knew nothing of torture or of arbitrary imprisonment, or of the barbarous punishment of the wheel, and no English executions were quite so horrible as those which took place in the Cevennes in the early years of the eighteenth century, or as the prolonged and hideous agonies which Damiens endured for several hours, in 1757. But this is about all that can be said. Executions in England till very lately have been a favourite public spectacle—it may almost be said a public amusement—and in the last century everything seemed done to make the people familiar with their most frightful aspects. A ghastly row of heads of the rebels of 1745 mouldered along the top of Temple Bar. Gallows were erected in every important quarter of the city, and on many of them corpses were left rotting in chains. When Blackstone wrote, there were no less than 160 offences in England punishable with death, and it was a very ordinary occurrence for ten or twelve culprits to be hanged on a single occasion, for forty or fifty to be condemned at a single assize. In 1732 seventy persons received sentence of death at the Old Bailey,¹ and in the same year we find eighteen persons hanged in one day in the not very considerable town of Cork.² Often the criminals staggered intoxicated to the

¹ Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, p. 271.

² *Dublin Weekly Journal*, April 22, 1732. See, too, Mad-

gallows, and some of the most noted were exhibited for money by the turnkeys before their execution. No less than 200*l.* is said to have been made in this manner in a few days when Sheppard was prisoner in Newgate.¹ Dr. Dodd, the unhappy clergyman who was executed for forgery, was exhibited for two hours in the press-room at a shilling a head before he was led to the gallows.²

‘The executions of criminals,’ wrote a Swiss traveller in the beginning of the eighteenth century, ‘return every six weeks regularly with the sessions. The criminals pass through the streets in carts, dressed in their best clothes, with white gloves and nosegays, if it be the season. Those that die merrily or that don’t at least show any great fear of death, are said to die like gentlemen; and to merit this encomium most of them die like beasts, without any concern, or like fools, having no other view than to divert the crowd. . . . Though there is something very melancholy in this, yet a man cannot well forbear laughing to see these rogues set themselves off as heroes by an affectation of despising death. . . . The frequent executions, the great numbers that suffer together, and the applauses of the crowd, may contribute something to it, and the brandy which they swallow before their setting out helps to stun them.’³ Women who were found guilty of murdering their husbands, or of the other offences comprised under the terms high or petit treason, were publicly burnt, by a law which was not abolished till 1790.⁴ A stake ten or eleven feet high

den’s *Hist. of Periodical Literature in Ireland*, i. 258; and for an almost equally striking instance in 1787 at Worcester, Roberts’ *Social Hist. of the Southern Counties*, p. 152.

¹ Harris’s *Life of Hardwicke*, i. 158.

² *Public Ledger*, quoted by Andrews, p. 281.

³ Muralt’s *Letters on the English Nation* (English trans. 1726), pp. 42–44.

⁴ ‘In treasons of every kind the punishment of women is the same, and different from that of

was planted in the ground. An iron ring was fastened near the top, and from it the culprit was hung while the faggots were kindled under her feet. The law enjoined that she should be burnt alive, but in practice the sentence was usually mitigated, and she was strangled before the fire touched her body. A horrible case, however, occurred in 1726 at the execution of a murderess named Katherine Hayes. The fire scorching the hands of the executioner, he slackened the rope before he strangled her, and though fresh faggots were hastily piled up, a considerable time elapsed before her agonies were terminated.¹ The law which condemned a man guilty of high treason to be cut down when half hanged, to be disembowelled, and to have his bowels burnt before his face, was still executed in ghastly detail.² The law which condemned a prisoner who refused to plead on a capital charge to be laid naked on his back in a dark room, while weights of stone or iron were placed on his breast till he was slowly pressed to death, was enforced in England in 1721 and in 1735, and in Ireland as late as 1740. A criminal was sentenced in England to the same fate in 1741, but he at last con-

men. For as the natural modesty of the sex forbids the exposing and publicly mangling their bodies, their sentence (which is to the full as terrible to the sense as the other) is, to be drawn to the gallows and there to be burnt alive.'—*Blackstone*, iv. ch. vi.

¹ Andrews, p. 279. See, too her life, in *The Lives of Eminent Criminals executed between 1720 and 1735*.

² See Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, p. 281. Eight persons guilty of holding commissions in the army of the Pretender, were executed in 1746 on Kennington

Common. The *State Trials* (xviii. 351) give the following description of the execution of Mr. Townley, who was one of them: 'After he had hung six minutes, he was cut down, and, having life in him as he lay upon the block to be quartered, the executioner gave him several blows on his breast, which not having the effect required, he immediately cut his throat; after which he took his head off; then ripped him open and took out his bowels and heart and threw them into the fire, which consumed them; then he slashed

sented to plead ; and the law was not repealed till 1772.¹ The punishment of the pillory, which was very common, seemed specially adapted to encourage the brutality of the populace, and there are several instances of culprits who perished from the usage they underwent. Men, and even women, were still whipped publicly at the tail of a cart through the streets, and the flogging of women in England was only abolished in 1820.²

On the whole, however, the institutions and manners of the country were steadily assuming their modern aspect. From the ministry of Walpole the House of Commons had become indisputably the most powerful body in the State. Then it was that the post of First Lord of the Treasury came to be universally recognised as the head of the Government. Then it was that the forms of parliamentary procedure were in many respects

his four quarters and put them with the head into a coffin.'

¹ Andrews, pp. 285, 286. The last case is from the *Universal Spectator*, Sept. 1741. 'On Tuesday, was sentenced to death at the Old Bailey, Henry Cook, shoemaker, of Stratford, for robbing Mr. Zachary on the highway. On Cook's refusing to plead, there was a new press made and fixed in the proper place in the press-yard, there having been no person pressed since the famous Spiggott, the highwayman, about twenty years ago. Burnworth, alias Frazier, was pressed at Kingston, in Surrey, about sixteen years ago.' The Irish case was at Kilkenny. Madden, *Periodical Literature*, i. 274. See, too, the *Annual Register*, 1770, pp. 163-165.

² See the very large collection of passages from old newspapers

and magazines, illustrating the penal system in England, in Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, and in that great repository of curious information, *Notes and Queries*. See, too, Knight's *London*, Cowper's *Hist. of the Rod*, and Madden's *Hist. of Periodical Literature in Ireland*. For cases of criminals being killed by the ill-usage they underwent in the pillory, see Prior's *Life of Burke*, i. 367; Nichols' *Memoirs of Hogarth*, pp. 190, 191. Johnson wrote a very humane and sensible protest against the multiplication of capital offences, *Rambler*, No. 114, and Fielding in his *Causes of the Increase of Robbers* advocated private executions. The public whipping of women in England was abolished in 1817, the private whipping only in 1820.

definitely fixed. In 1730 the absurd practice of drawing up the written pleadings in the law courts in Latin was abolished, in spite of the strenuous opposition of the Chief Justice Lord Raymond.¹ The last attempt to impeach a Prime Minister was when Walpole was overthrown; the last battle fought on British soil was in the rebellion of 1745. The last traces of the old exemptions from the dominion of the law were removed by the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions in Scotland, and of the right of sanctuary in London; and the most conspicuous sign of the insular spirit of the nation disappeared when England consented to adopt the same calendar as the most civilised nations on the Continent.

It was at this time, also, that the modern military system was firmly established. An aversion to a standing army in time of peace had long been one of the strongest of English sentiments, and it was one in which both the great parties of the State cordially concurred. The Tories were never weary of dilating upon the military despotism of Cromwell, which had left an indelible impression on the mind of the nation, while the army of 30,000 men which James had maintained without the consent of Parliament, furnished one of the gravest Whig charges against that sovereign. Of all the measures that accompanied the Restoration, none had been more popular than the disbandment of the army of Cromwell; but soon after, a conflict began between the Crown and the Legislature, which continually recurred with aggravated severity up to the time of the Revolution. The last two Stuart sovereigns aimed at the maintenance, in time of peace, of a considerable military force altogether subject to their control. They governed it by articles of war. They assumed or claimed as part of their prerogative, a power unknown to the law, of

¹ Campbell's *Lives of the Chancellors*, vi. 119, 120.

administering justice and inflicting punishments on their soldiers by courts-martial; and James, in defiance of the Test Act, had bestowed numerous military commands upon Catholics. The steady policy of Parliament, on the other hand, was to develop the militia, which it was assumed could never become inimical to the liberties of England; to insist upon the disbandment, in time of peace, of the whole army, except, perhaps, a body-guard for the King and garrisons for the forts; and to maintain the exclusion of Catholics from commands, and the principle that punishments in time of peace could only be inflicted by order of the civil magistrate. The great part which this conflict had in preparing the Revolution is well known; and an article of the Bill of Rights expressly provided that, without the consent of Parliament, the raising or keeping of a standing army within the kingdom was illegal. It soon, however, became evident to all sagacious observers that a considerable army was indispensable if England were ever to engage in a land war with continental nations. The French army, which under Henry IV. consisted of 14,000 men, amounted, after the Peace of Nimeguen, to no less than 140,000;¹ and before the close of his reign Lewis XIV. is said to have had as many as 360,000 men at one time under arms. The Emperor Charles VI. employed 170,000 soldiers in the war of 1733. The Prussian army, on the accession of Frederick the Great, consisted of 76,000 men; and every petty German ruler was augmenting his forces. The genius of Parma, Turenne, Condé, and Vauban transformed the art of war, and every improvement made a hastily levied militia more helpless before a disciplined army. Vauban and Cohorn may almost be said to have created the art of attacking and defending

¹ Heeren.

fortresses. Mining acquired a prominence in warfare, and was conducted with a skill formerly utterly unknown. Transportable copper pontoons for crossing rivers were invented by the French in 1672. The invention of the fixed bayonet has been attributed both to Mackay and to Vauban; and the Prussian infantry attained a perfection in manœuvring and a rapidity in firing which made every battalion a walking battery, and was speedily copied in the rest of Europe.¹

All these changes, by giving a new perfection to the art of war, made it evident that the time had arrived when a considerable permanent body of highly trained soldiers was necessary for the security of the State; and that necessity in England was still more felt on account of the perpetual fear of a Jacobite insurrection. But a permanent army could not exist unless adequate means were provided for preserving its discipline, especially at a time when the dispositions of the troops were doubtful or divided. The declaration of 800 soldiers at Ipswich in favour of James in 1689 produced the first Mutiny Act, which was enacted for six months, and which enabled courts-martial to punish mutiny and desertion by death.² The press-gang soon came into use, and it was much employed in time of war as a kind of irregular police; suspected criminals, or notorious bad characters, against whom no definite charge could be proved, being in this manner draughted in great numbers into the army. An Act of Anne gave justices of the peace express power to levy as soldiers such able-bodied men in their districts as had 'no lawful calling or employment, or visible means for their maintenance or livelihood.'³

There are few more curious pages in English history

¹ Frederick II., *Mémoires de mon Temps*. See, too, for other military statistics, Ranke's *Hist. of Prussia*, i. 420, 421. Lord

Hervey's *Memoirs*, i. 86.

² Macaulay's *Hist.*

³ 3 & 4 Anne, c. 11.

than the slow and gradual change of public opinion on the subject of standing armies. For more than half a century the battle continued with almost unabated violence, and a century had elapsed before it altogether subsided. The Mutiny Act was regarded as a purely temporary contrivance, but it was soon felt by most experienced men that it was impossible to govern the army if military insubordination or desertion were treated as mere breaches of contract, and were punishable only by the civil courts. The Mutiny Act was accordingly re-enacted, sometimes for six months, more frequently for a year, but it was long before it was recognised as permanently necessary. In the reigns of William and Anne there were several periods—one of them lasting for more than two years—in which it was not in force, and its invariable enactment dates only from George I. Its opponents dwelt upon the danger of severing by a special code of laws the members of the army from their fellow-citizens, and of tampering with the great constitutional principle that the civil magistrate in time of peace should have sole jurisdiction for the suppression of crime; and they urged that to permit the Sovereign, of his own authority, to establish articles of war, and erect courts-martial for enforcing them, was to vest a sole legislative power in the Crown. On these grounds Windham and Shippen, at the head of the Tory party, strenuously opposed the Mutiny Act. Walpole took the same course, when he was in opposition to Stanhope, and his saying that ‘he who gives the power of blood gives blood’ was continually quoted by its opponents. In 1717 the power of inflicting capital punishment by sentence of court-martial on deserters and mutineers was only carried by 247 to 229,¹ and most of the extensions which the Act

¹ See the remarkable account of the debate in *Tindal*.

underwent were fiercely contested. The Act of 1689 provided only for the punishment of mutiny and desertion, without exempting any officer or soldier from the ordinary processes of law, and its operation was restricted to the regular army and to England. The scope of the Act was gradually extended to Jersey and Guernsey, to Ireland, and at length to the whole dominion of the Crown. The Mutiny Act of 1713, which was the first passed in time of peace, gave courts-martial no power to award a capital sentence, and this incapacity continued till the rebellion of 1715. Under George I. the Crown for the first time obtained an express and formal authority to constitute, under royal sign manual, articles of war for the government of the army, and to enforce their penalties by courts-martial. The articles of war of 1717 made provision for the trial of ordinary civil offences by courts-martial, and the Mutiny Act declared that acquittal or conviction should be a bar to all further indictment for the same offence. In 1728, however, a question arose whether the articles of war which emanated from the Sovereign alone, could create capital offences unknown to the law, and the Attorney-General advised the Government that while the power of inflicting other penalties by those articles was unrestricted, no sentence extending to life or limb could be imposed by court-martial except for offences enumerated in, and made so punishable by, the Mutiny Act; and a clause to this effect has been inserted in every Mutiny Act since 1748. In 1748, too, an oath of secrecy was first imposed upon the members of courts-martial forbidding them to divulge the sentence till approved, or the votes of any member, unless required by Parliament. The position of half-pay officers was long and vehemently discussed. It was contended by the Government that they were subject to the Mutiny Act, but the opinions of the judges were divided on the

question. A special clause making them liable was inserted in the Act of 1747, but it was withdrawn in 1749, and in 1785 their exemption was decided. In 1754 the operation of the Mutiny Act was extended to the troops of the East India Company serving in India, and to the King's troops serving in North America, as well as to local troops serving with them. In 1756 the militia, when called out for active service, were brought under its provisions; and in 1788, in spite of the strong opposition of Fox and Sheridan, the corps of sappers and miners was included in the same category.¹

The extreme distrust with which this department of legislation was regarded is shown by the strong opposition that was aroused over almost all the questions I have enumerated. The first volume of the Commentaries of Blackstone was published as late as 1765, and it is remarkable that even at this date that great lawyer spoke with the strongest apprehension of the dangers to liberty arising from the Mutiny Act. He maintained that the condition of the army was that of absolute servitude; and he argued that every free and prudent nation should endeavour to prevent the introduction of slavery into the midst of it; that if it has unhappily been introduced, arms should at least never be placed in the hands of the slaves, and that no policy could be more suicidal than to deprive of the liberties of the constitution the very men who are at the last resort entrusted with their defence.² But whatever plausibility there may be in such reasoning, it will now hardly be disputed that a body of many thousands of armed men, whose prompt and unreasoning obedience

¹ See, for the origin of the Mutiny Act, Macaulay's *Hist. of England*, ch. xi., and for its sub-

sequent history, Clode's *Military Forces of the Crown*, vol. i.

² Blackstone, book i. ch. xiii.

is of the utmost moment to the State, cannot be permanently governed by the mild and tardy processes of law which are applicable to civilians. Military insubordination is so grave and, at the same time, so contagious a disease, that it requires the promptest and most decisive remedies to prevent it from leading to anarchy. By retaining a strict control over the pay and over the numbers of the soldiers, by limiting each Mutiny Act to a single year, and by entrusting its carriage through the House to a civil minister, who is responsible for its provisions, Parliament has very effectually guarded against abuses; and the army, since the days of the Commonwealth, has never been inimical to the liberties of England.

The jealousy that was felt about the Mutiny Act extended to other parts of military administration. After the Peace of Ryswick, Parliament insisted on reducing the forces to 10,000 men, or about a third part of what William considered necessary for the security of the State; and during the greater part of the first two Hanoverian reigns there was an annual conflict about the number of the forces. In 1717 Walpole himself, being at this time in Opposition, was prominent in urging their reduction from 16,000 to 12,000 men. During his own administration the army in time of peace was usually about 17,000 men. The terror which was produced by the Scotch invasion of 1745, the frequent alarms of a French invasion, the popularity of the wars of the elder Pitt, and the great extension of the Empire resulting from his conquests, gradually led to increased armaments; nor was the growth of the regular army seriously checked by the organisation, between 1757 and 1763, of a national militia. In the early years of the eighteenth century the number of soldiers in Parliament was much complained of, and some unsuccessful efforts were made to

diminish it.¹ Walpole desired to avail himself of the military as of other forms of patronage for the purpose of gratifying his supporters and thus securing his parliamentary majority; but George II., to his great credit, steadily refused to allow the army to be dragged into the vortex of corruption,² though he consented to deprive the Duke of Bolton and Lord Cobham of their regiments on account of their votes against the excise scheme. A Bill was at this time introduced to prevent any officer above the rank of colonel from being thus deprived, except by a court-martial or an address from

¹ In 1741 some members of the House of Lords drew up a very remarkable protest on this subject. After complaining of the increase of the army, and of the formation of new corps, they say: 'We apprehend that this method of augmentation by new corps may be attended with consequences fatal in time to our Constitution, by increasing the number of commissions which may be disposed of with regard to parliamentary influence only. . . . Our distrust of the motives of this augmentation which creates at once 370 officers . . . ought to be the greater so near the election of a new parliament . . . and we cannot forget that an augmentation of 8,040 men was likewise made the very year of the election of the present Parliament. . . . The number of officers in Parliament has gradually increased, and though we think the gentlemen of the army as little liable to undue influence as any other body of men, yet we think it would be very imprudent to trust the very fundamentals of our Constitution, the indepen-

dency of Parliaments, to the uncertain effects of ministerial favour or resentment.'—Rogers' *Protests of the Lords*, ii. 1-6.

² Walpole himself complained to Lord Hervey: 'How many people there are I could bind to me by getting things done in the army you may imagine, and that I never can get any one thing done in it you perhaps will not believe; but it is as true as that there is an army, that I never ask for the smallest commission by which a Member of Parliament may be immediately or collaterally obliged, that the King's answer is not—"I won't do that; you want always to have me disoblige all my old soldiers, you understand nothing of troops. I will order my army as I think fit; for your scoundrels in the House of Commons you may do as you please; you know I never interfere nor pretend to know anything of them, but this province I will keep to myself."—Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, ii. 381, 382. This is not the least of the many unrecognised services of George II. to the country.

one House of Parliament. Considering the great power of the ministry in both Houses, it is not surprising that this measure should have been defeated by large majorities, but it is a very remarkable fact that it should have been extremely unpopular. The manner in which Walpole exercised his power was very scandalous. The desire to restrict the corrupt influence of the Government was very strong, and the excise scheme was generally detested; but so deep and so lively after the lapse of more than seventy years was the hatred of military government which the despotism of Cromwell had planted in the nation that it was sufficient to overpower all other considerations. It was contended that the measure of the Opposition, by relaxing the authority of the civil power over the military system and by aggrandising that of the courts-martial, would increase the independence and the strength of standing armies, and in consequence the dangers of a stratocracy; and it is a curious and well-attested fact that it very seriously impaired the popularity of the party who proposed it.¹

The last sign that may be noticed of the unpopularity of a standing army was the extreme reluctance of Parliament to provide barracks adequate for its accommodation. In Ireland, it is true, which was governed like a conquered country, a different policy was pursued, and a large grant for their erection was made as early as William III.,² while in Scotland they chiefly date from

¹ Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, i. 282-284. Coxe's *Walpole*, i. 409. *Parl. Hist.* ix. 291. William had positively refused to remove Sir G. Rooke from the Admiralty on account of his votes in the House of Commons. Wilson's *Life of Defoe*, i. 469.

² Clode. Chesterfield appears

to have contemplated a considerable multiplication of barracks. As his biographer somewhat strangely says: 'If his Lordship had returned to Ireland he would have ordered new barracks to be built in those parts of the kingdom which are not amenable to the laws of the country. By

the rebellion of 1715, but in England the barrack accommodation till a much later period was miserably insufficient.¹ Even at the time when the army had acquired very considerable dimensions the majority of the troops were still billeted out in public-houses, kept under canvas during the most inclement portions of the year, or stowed away in barns that were purchased for the purpose. Pulteney contended that the very fact that a standing army in quarters is more burdensome than a standing army in barracks is a reason for opposing the erection of the latter, lest the people should grow accustomed to the yoke.² 'The people of this kingdom,' said General Wade in 1740, 'have been taught to associate the ideas of barracks and slavery, like darkness and the devil.'³ Blackstone, in 1765, strongly maintained that the soldiers should live 'intermixed with the people,' and that 'no separate camp, no barracks, no inland fortress, should be allowed.'⁴ It was about this time, however, that the popular jealousy of the army began first perceptibly to decline. In 1760 Lord Bath published a pamphlet which is in more than one respect remarkable, but which is especially interesting for the evidence it furnishes of this change.

this provision he wished to make the inhabitants know that there is a God, a king, and a government.'—Maty's *Life of Chesterfield*, p. 271.

¹ Clode's *Military Forces*, i. 221–226. A writer who visited Scotland about 1722, speaking of Berwick-on-Tweed, says: 'King George, since his accession to the throne, to ease the inhabitants of this town from quartering of soldiers, hath built a fine barrack here consisting of a square

spacious court of freestone. . . . These are the first barracks erected in Great Britain, and it would be a vast ease to the inhabitants in most great towns if they had them everywhere; but English liberty will never consent to what will seem a nest for a standing army.'—Macky's *Journey through Scotland* (1723), pp. 24, 25.

² *Parl. Hist.* xi. 1448.

³ *Ibid.* 1442.

⁴ Book i. ch. xiii.

He complained bitterly that the country had become strangely tolerant of a far larger peace establishment than had once been regarded as compatible with the security of the Constitution; that the members of the great families were beginning to enlist in large numbers in the army, not only in time of war, but also as a permanent profession in time of peace; and that the erection of barracks, which twenty years before would have ruined any minister who proposed it, was now accepted without serious protest, or even with popular applause.¹ Still the old feeling of distrust was not wholly extinct. The scheme of fortification proposed by the younger Pitt, in 1786, was rejected on the ground that it would render necessary and would provide accommodation for a larger standing army;² and in 1792, when a barrack department was instituted for the purpose of erecting barracks throughout the country, a considerable opposition was shown to the scheme. Fox and Grey, as the representatives of the Whigs, vehemently denounced it in the beginning of 1793, maintaining, like Pelham, Pulteney, and Blackstone,

¹ 'What I lament is to see the sentiments of the nation so amazingly reconciled to the prospect of having a far more numerous body of regular troops kept up after the peace than any true lover of his country in former times thought could be allowed without endangering the Constitution. Nay, so unaccountably fond are we become of the military plan, that the erection of barracks, which twenty years ago would have ruined any minister who should have ventured to propose it, may be proposed safely by our own ministers nowadays, and upon trial be found to be a

favourite measure with our patriots and with the public in general. . . . What I lament, as the greatest misfortune that can threaten the public liberty, is to see the eagerness with which our nobility, born to be the guardians of the Constitution against prerogative, solicit the badge of military subjection, not merely to serve their country in times of danger, which would be commendable, but in expectation of being continued soldiers when tranquillity shall be restored.'—*Letter to Two Great Men* (Newcastle and Pitt), p. 35.

² Clode.

that the erection of barracks was menacing and unconstitutional, and that the dangers of a standing army could only be averted if the soldiers were closely mixed with the populace.¹

¹ *Parl. Hist.* xxx. 474-496.

CHAPTER V.

I PROPOSE to devote this chapter to a brief sketch of the leading intellectual and social changes of the period we have been examining which have not fallen within the scope of the preceding narrative. In the higher forms of intellect, if we omit the best works of Pope and Swift, who belong chiefly to the reign of Anne, the reigns of George I. and George II. were, on the whole, not prolific, but the influence of the Press was great and growing, though periodical writing was far less brilliant than in the preceding period. Among other writers, Fielding, Lyttelton, and Chesterfield occasionally contributed to it. The 'Craftsman' especially, though now utterly neglected, is said to have once attained a circulation of 10,000, was believed to have eclipsed the 'Spectator,' and undoubtedly contributed largely to the downfall of Walpole. Though set up by Bolingbroke and Pulteney, it was edited by an obscure and disreputable writer named Amhurst, who devoted nearly twenty years to the service of the faction, but who was utterly neglected by them in the compromise of 1742. He died of a broken heart, and owed his grave to the charity of a bookseller. We have already seen the large sum which Walpole, though in general wholly indifferent to literary merit, bestowed upon the Government Press, and its writers were also occasionally rewarded by Government patronage. Thus Trenchard, the author of 'Cato's Letters,' obtained the post of 'commissioner of wine-licences' from Walpole; and Concannon, another

ministerial writer, was made Attorney-General of Jamaica by Newcastle. In 1724 there were three daily and five weekly papers printed in London, as well as ten which appeared three times a week.¹

The number steadily increased, and a provincial Press gradually grew up. The first trace of newspapers outside London is in the time of the Commonwealth, when the contending armies carried with them printing presses for the purpose of issuing reports of their proceedings; but the first regular provincial papers appear to have been created in the last decade of the seventeenth century, and by the middle of the eighteenth century almost every important provincial town had its local organ. Political caricatures, which were probably Italian in their origin,² came into fashion in England during the South Sea panic. Caricatures on cards, which were for a time exceedingly popular, were invented by George Townshend, in 1756.³ As the century advanced, the political importance of the Press became very apparent. 'Newspapers,' said a writer in the 'Gentleman's Magazine' of 1731, 'are of late so multiplied as to render it impossible, unless a man makes it his business, to consult them all. . . . Upon calculating the number of newspapers it is found that (besides divers written accounts) no less than 200 half-sheets per month are thrown from the press, only in

¹ Andrews' *Hist. of British Journalism*, i. 129.

² In the autobiography of Lord Shelburne there is a curious anecdote on the subject of caricatures. 'He [Lord Melcombe] told me that coming home through Brussels, he was presented to Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, after her disgrace. She said to him, "Young man, you come from Italy; they tell me of a new in-

vention there called caricature drawing. Can you find me somebody that will make me a caricature of Lady Masham, describing her covered with running sores and ulcers, that I may send it to the Queen to give her a right idea of her new favourite?" (p. 122).

³ Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* ii. 228.

London, and about as many printed elsewhere in the three kingdoms; . . . so that they are become the chief channels of amusement and intelligence.’¹ ‘The people of Great Britain,’ said Mr. Danvers in 1738, ‘are governed by a power that never was heard of as a supreme authority in any age or country before. . . . It is the government of the Press. The stuff which our weekly newspapers are filled with is received with greater reverence than Acts of Parliament, and the sentiments of one of these scribblers have more weight with the multitude than the opinion of the best politician in the kingdom.’² ‘No species of literary men,’ wrote Dr. Johnson in 1758, ‘has lately been so much multiplied as the writers of news. Not many years ago the nation was content with one Gazette, but now we have not only in the metropolis, papers of every morning and every evening, but almost every large town has its weekly historian.’³ One of the consequences of the complete subjection of literary men to the booksellers was the creation of magazines, which afforded a more certain and rapid remuneration than books, and gave many writers a scanty and precarious subsistence. The ‘Gentleman’s Magazine’ appeared in 1731. It was speedily followed by its rival, the ‘London Magazine;’ and in 1750 there were eight periodicals of this kind. In the middle of the eighteenth century also, literary reviews began in England. In 1752 there were three—the ‘Literary,’ the ‘Critical,’ and the ‘Monthly.’ The stamp duty and the advertisement duty established under Anne still remained, and under George II. an additional tax of $\frac{1}{2}d.$ had been imposed on newspapers, and an additional duty of a shilling on advertisements; but the demand for this form of literature was so great

¹ Advertisement to the first number of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*.

² *Parl. Hist.* x. 448.

³ *The Idler*, No. 30.

that these impositions do not appear to have seriously checked it.¹ The essay writers had made it their great object as much as possible to popularise and diffuse knowledge, and to bring down every question to a level with the capacities of the idlest reader; and without any great change in education, any display of extraordinary genius, or any real enthusiasm for knowledge, the circle of intelligence was slowly enlarged. The progress was probably even greater among women than among men. Swift, in one of his latest letters, noticed the great improvement which had taken place during his lifetime in the education and in the writing of ladies;² and it is to this period that some of the best female correspondence in our literature belongs.

The prevailing coarseness, however, of fashionable life and sentiment was but little mitigated. The writings of Swift, Defoe, Fielding, Coventry, and Smollett are sufficient to illustrate the great difference which in this respect separated the first half of the eighteenth century from our own day, and unlike Anne, the first two Hanoverian sovereigns did nothing to improve the prevailing tone. Each king lived publicly with mistresses, and the immorality of their Courts was accompanied by nothing of that refinement or grace which has often cast a softening veil over much deeper and more general corruption. On this subject the vivid and undoubtedly authentic picture of the Court of George II. which is furnished by Lord Hervey enables us to speak with much confidence. Few figures in the history of the time are more worthy of study than that shrewd and

¹ See, on the History of Newspapers, Chalmers' *Life of Ruddiman*. Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. iv. Hunt's *Fourth Estate*. Andrews' *Hist. of British Jour-*

nalism. Madden's *Hist. of Irish Periodical Literature*. Wright's *England under the House of Hanover*.

² Mrs. Delany's *Correspondence*, i. 551.

coarse-minded Queen, who by such infinite adroitness, and by such amazing condescensions, succeeded in obtaining insensibly a complete command over the mind of her husband, and a powerful influence over the politics of England. Living herself a life of unsullied virtue, discharging under circumstances of peculiar difficulty the duties of a wife with the most exemplary patience and diligence, exercising her great influence in Church and State with singular wisdom, patriotism, and benevolence, she passed through life jesting on the vices of her husband and of his ministers with the coarseness of a trooper, receiving from her husband the earliest and fullest accounts of every new love affair in which he was engaged, and prepared to welcome each new mistress, provided only she could herself keep the first place in his judgment and in his confidence. The character of their relation remained unbroken to the end. No stranger death scene was ever painted than that of Caroline,¹ nor can we easily find a more striking illustration of the inconsistencies of human nature than that a woman so coarse and cynical in her judgments of others should have herself died a victim of an excessive and misplaced delicacy.² The works of Richardson,

¹ The Queen had always wished the King to marry again. 'She had often said so when he was present and when he was not present, and when she was in health, and gave it now, as her advice to him when she was dying; upon which his sobs began to rise, and his tears to fall with double vehemence. Whilst in the midst of this passion, wiping his eyes and sobbing between every word, with much ado he got out this answer: "Non, j'aurai des maîtresses." To which the Queen made no other reply than: "Ah,

mon Dieu! cela n'empêche pas." I know this episode will hardly be credited, but it is literally true.' —Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, ii. 513, 514.

² She had for fourteen years suffered from a rupture which she could not bring herself to reveal except to her husband. When on her death-bed, and suffering extreme agony, she still concealed it from her doctors, and it was contrary to her ardent wish that the King, too late to save her, told them of her complaint. Lord Hervey, ii. 505, 506.

which appeared between 1740 and 1753, and which at once attained an extraordinary popularity, probably contributed something to refine the tone of society, but the improvement was not very perceptible till the reign of George III. Sir Walter Scott, in a well-known anecdote, has illustrated very happily the change that had taken place. He tells us that a grand-aunt of his own assured him that the novels of Aphra Behn were as current upon the toilet table in her youth as the novels of Miss Edgeworth in her old age, and he has described very vividly the astonishment of his old relative when, curiosity leading her, after a long interval of years, to turn over the forgotten pages she had delighted in when young, she found that, sitting alone at the age of eighty, she was unable to read without shame a book, which sixty years before she had heard read out for amusement in large circles consisting of the best society in London.¹

In one respect during the first half of the eighteenth century there was a marked deterioration. The passion for gambling, which had been very prevalent since the Restoration, appears to have attained its climax under the first two Georges. It had been very considerably stimulated by the madness of speculation which infected all classes during the South Sea mania. That desire to make rapid fortunes, that contempt for the slow and steady gains of industry, which has in our own day so often produced the wildest combinations of recklessness and credulity, was never more apparent. Scheme after scheme of the most fantastic description rose, and glittered, and burst. Companies for 'Fishing up Wrecks on the Irish Coast,' for 'Insurance against Losses by Servants,' for 'Making Salt Water Fresh,' for 'Extracting Silver from Lead,' for 'Transmuting Quick-

¹ Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, v. 136, 137.

silver into Malleable and Fine Metal,' for 'Importing Jackasses from Spain,' for 'Trading in Human Hair,' for 'A Wheel for Perpetual Motion,' as well as many others, attracted crowds of eager subscribers. One projector announced a Company 'for an undertaking which shall in due time be revealed,' each subscriber to pay at once two guineas, and afterwards to receive a share of a hundred, with a disclosure of the object. In a single morning he received 2,000 guineas, with which he immediately decamped.¹

It was natural that this passion for speculation should have stimulated the taste for gambling in private life. It had long been inveterate among the upper classes, and it soon rose to an unprecedented height. The chief, or at least the most prominent, centre was White's chocolate-house. Swift tells us that Lord Oxford never passed it without bestowing on it a curse as 'the bane of the English nobility;' and it continued during the greater part of the century to be the scene of the wildest and most extravagant gambling. It was, however, only the most prominent among many similar establishments which sprang up around Charing Cross, Leicester Fields, and Golden Square. The Duke of Devonshire lost an estate at a game of basset. The fine intellect of Chesterfield was thoroughly enslaved by the vice. At Bath, which was then the centre of English fashion, it reigned supreme; and the physicians even recommended it to their patients as a form of distraction. In the green-rooms of the theatres, as Mrs. Bellamy assures us, thousands were often lost and won in a single night. Among fashionable ladies the passion was quite as strong as among men, and the professor of whist and quadrille became a regular attendant at their levees. Miss Pelham, the daughter of the prime

¹ Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, vol. iii.

minister, was one of the most notorious gamblers of her time, and Lady Cowper speaks in her 'Diary' of sittings at Court at which the lowest stake was 200 guineas. The public lotteries contributed very powerfully to diffuse the taste for gambling among all classes. They had begun in England in the seventeenth century; and though more than once forbidden, they enabled the Government to raise money with so little unpopularity that they were again resorted to. 'I cannot forbear telling you,' wrote Addison to an Irish friend in 1711, 'that last week I drew a prize of 1,000*l.* in the lottery.'¹ Fielding wrote a satire on the passion for lotteries prevalent in his time. The discovery of some gross frauds in their management contributed to throw them into discredit, and Pelham is said to have expressed some disapproval of them, but they were not finally suppressed in England till 1823. Westminster Bridge, which was begun in 1736, was built chiefly from the produce of lotteries. Another instance of their employment is deserving of special remembrance, for it is connected with the origin of one of the most valuable of London institutions. In 1753 lotteries were established to purchase the Sloane collection and the Harleian manuscripts, which were combined with the Cottonian collection, and deposited in Montague House under the name of the British Museum.²

Concerning the amusements and social life of the upper classes, I shall content myself with making a few somewhat miscellaneous observations. The subject is a very large one, and it would require volumes to exhaust it; but it is, I think, possible to select from the mass of

¹ Addison to Jos. Dawson. (Dec. 18, 1711) Departmental Correspondence. Irish State Paper Office.

² Macpherson, iii. 300. Beck-

mann's *Hist. of Inventions*, ii. 423-429. The passion for gambling in England appears in all the correspondence and other light literature of the time.

details a few facts which are not without a real historic importance, as indicating the tendencies of taste, and thus throwing some light on the moral history of the nation.

It was said that the Revolution brought four tastes into England, two of which were chiefly due to Mary, and two to her husband. To Mary was due a passion for coloured East Indian calicoes, which speedily spread through all classes of the community, and also a passion for rare and eccentric porcelain, which continued for some generations to be a favourite topic with the satirists. William, on his side, set the fashion of picture-collecting, and gave a great impulse to gardening.¹ This latter taste, which forms one of the healthiest elements in English country life, attained its height in the first half of the eighteenth century, and it took a form which was entirely new. In the reign of Charles II. the parks of Greenwich and St. James had been laid out by the great French gardener Le Nôtre, and the taste which he made general in Europe reigned in its most exaggerated form in England. It appeared to be a main object to compel nature to recede as far as possible, to repress every irregularity, to make the human hand apparent in every shrub, and to convert gardening into an anomalous form of sculpture. The trees were habitually carved into cones, or pyramids, or globes, into smooth, even walls, or into fantastic groups of men and animals. The flower-beds were laid out symmetrically in architectural figures. Long, straight, and formal alleys, a perfect uniformity of design, and a constant recurrence of similar forms, were essential to a well-arranged garden. The passion for gardening, however, at this time took some root in England, and the writings of Evelyn did much to extend it. William introduced the fashion of masses of clipped yews form-

¹ Defoe's *Tour through Great Britain*, i. 121-124.

ing the avenue or shading the approaches of the house, and of imposing iron gates. Sir William Temple, in his essay 'On the Garden of Epicurus,' accurately reflected the prevailing taste. But early in the eighteenth century two great gardeners—Bridgeman, who died in 1737, and Kent, who died in 1748—originated a new form of landscape gardening, which speedily acquired an almost universal popularity. They utterly discarded all vegetable sculpture and all symmetry of design, gave free scope to the wild, luxuriant, and irregular beauties of nature, and made it their aim to reproduce, as far as possible, in a small compass its variety and its freedom. The essay in which Bacon had urged that one part of a garden should be made an imitation of unrestricted nature, the description of Paradise in Milton, and the description of the garden of Armida in Tasso, were cited as foreshadowing the change, and at a later period the poetry of Thomson undoubtedly contributed to sustain it. Addison and Pope laid out their gardens on the new plan, and defended it with their pens,¹ and the latter is said to have greatly assisted Kent by his advice. Spence and Horace Walpole were enthusiastic disciples.² The new system was made the subject of a graceful poem by Mason, and of an ingenious essay by Shenstone, and in 1770 appeared Whately's 'Observations on Modern Gardening,' which was the first considerable standard work in England upon the subject. The gardens of the Prince of Wales at Carlton House were imitated from that of Pope at Twickenham.³ Kensington

¹ See Addison's papers in *Spectator*, Nos. 414, 477, and Pope's very curious paper in *Guardian*, No. 173. See, too, Pope's *Moral Essays*, Ep. 4.

² Spence's *Anecdotes*, xxxi. Walpole on *Modern Gardening*.

See, too, his *Life of Kent*. See also, on the spread of the taste, Angeloni's *Letters on the English Nation*, ii. 266-274.

³ Walpole on *Modern Gardening*.

Gardens were laid out by Kent on the new plan, as well as the gardens of Claremont and Esher, those of Lord Burlington at Chiswick, and those of Lord Cobham at Stowe.

The example was speedily followed, and often exaggerated,¹ in every part of England, and the revolution of taste was accompanied by a great increase in the love of gardening. In the beginning of the century there were probably not more than 1,000 species of exotics in England, but before its close more than 5,000 new kinds were introduced. When Miller published the first edition of his 'Dictionary of Gardening' in 1724, only twelve species of evergreens were grown in the island, and the number of the plants cultivated in England is said to have more than doubled between 1731 and 1768.² Very many were introduced from Madeira, and the West Indies, which had been explored by Sir Hans Sloane, and from the American colonies, which had been explored by several independent investigators; and the taste for botany was still more diffused by the long controversies that followed the publication in 1735 of the great discovery of Linnæus about the sexual nature of plants.³ Landscape gardening is said to have been introduced into Ireland by Dr. Delany, the friend of Swift, and into Scotland by Lord Kames,⁴ but both countries remained in this respect far behind England. At Edinburgh a botanical garden appears to have existed as early as 1680.⁵ In Ireland a florists' club was established

¹ See, on these exaggerations, *The World*, Nos. 6, 15. The taste was carried so far that dead trees were sometimes planted, and every straight walk condemned.

² Loudon's *Encyclopædia of Gardening*, pp. 276, 277.

³ Miller's *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, i. 163-188.

⁴ Loudon's *Encyclopædia*, pp. 269, 273.

⁵ Pulteney's *Progress of Botany in England*, ii. 4.

by some Huguenot refugees in the reign of George I., but it met with no encouragement and speedily expired.¹ An Englishman named Threlkeld, who was settled in Dublin, published, in 1727, 'A Synopsis of Irish Plants;' and another work, entitled 'Botanologia Universalis Hibernica, or a general Irish Herbal,' was published in 1735 by a writer named Keogh.² In England the love for gardens and for botany continually extended, and it forms one of the most remarkable features in the history of national tastes during the first half of the eighteenth century.

The poet Gray, in a letter written in 1763, observes that 'our skill in gardening or laying out grounds is the only taste we can call our own, the only proof of original talent in matters of pleasure.' In architecture, it is true, England had produced one or two respectable and one really great name; and the Fire of London had given Wren a noble field for the display of his genius, but in other departments of art there was an almost absolute blank. Few questions in history are more perplexing, and perhaps insoluble, than the causes which govern the great manifestations of æsthetic genius. Germany, which up to the time of the Reformation was in this respect peculiarly prolific—Germany, which is now pre-eminently the land of artistic criticism, and which ranks high in artistic production—can scarcely be said to have produced a single painter of real genius during the long period that elapsed between the death of Holbein and the dawn of the nineteenth century. France, the richest, the most cultivated, the most luxurious nation on the Continent, in spite of a munificent royal patronage of art, was during the same period but little more successful. Many very considerable artists,

¹ London's *Encyclopædia*, p. 282.

² Pulteney's *Progress of Botany in England*, ii. 197–201.

no doubt, arose; but yet the nation which appears beyond all others to possess the gift of grace and delicacy of touch, which has created the Gobelins tapestry and the Sèvres china, and has governed through a long succession of generations the taste of Europe, could boast of no painter except Claude Lorraine, who had taken absolutely a foremost place; and its art was far inferior to that which grew up in more than one small Italian province, among the canals of Holland, or in the old cities of Flanders. But of all the great civilised nations, England in this respect ranked the last. Dobson, indeed, who had been brought forward by the patronage of Vandyck, and who died at the early age of thirty-six, showed some real talent for portrait-painting, and Oliver, Hilliard, and Cooper some skill in miniature; but still, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, not a single English painter or sculptor had taken a permanent place in European art, and the number of painters, even of third or fourth rate excellence, was very small. The principal, and, indeed, the most congenial, employment of the British artist appears to have been the production of the gaudy sign-boards which nearly every shopkeeper was then accustomed to hang out before his door.¹

This complete barrenness of British art is in many ways remarkable. No real deficiency of imagination can be attributed to a nation which has produced the noblest poetic literature in Christendom; and something had been done to stimulate artistic taste. Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and above all, Charles I., had warmly patronised art, and the latter was one of the two greatest collectors of his time. He purchased the cartoons of Raphael and the whole collection of the Duke of Mantua, which was then the most valuable

¹ *Spectator*, No. 28.

in Europe. He drew over to England both Rubens and Vandyck, and his competition with Philip IV. of Spain was so keen that it is said to have tripled the ordinary price of the works of the great artists.¹ In the early years of the eighteenth century the English were already famous for their assiduity in haunting the galleries in Italy,² and for their zeal in collecting pictures; and their aristocracy possessed ample wealth to enable them to gratify their desires. Catholicism is, no doubt, more favourable to art than Protestantism; but if the change of religion had in some degree impaired the appreciation of Italian or Spanish art, the English were at least in intimate connection with Holland, where a noble school existed which was essentially the creation of Protestantism. A few Italian and a long succession of Dutch and Flemish artists visited England. It possessed, indeed, an admirable school of painting, but it was a school which was represented almost exclusively by foreigners, by Holbein, Rubens, Vandyck, Lely, and Kneller. Foreign writers were accustomed to attribute the utter absence of native talent in art to the aspect of physical nature, and especially to the turbid and depressing gloom of a northern sky; but the explanation will hardly appear sufficient to those who remember that Rembrandt, Van der Helst, Potter, Gerard Dow, Cuyp, and many other artists of consummate power, grew up beneath a sky that is scarcely brighter than that of England, and in a country much less eminently endowed with natural beauty.

I do not pretend to explain fully this deficiency, but several partial solutions may be given. Puritanism

¹ Du Bos, *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie et sur la peinture*, ii. 152 (1733). Walpole's *Anec-*

dotes of Painting, ch. ix.

² *Ibid.*

was exceedingly inimical to art, and the Parliament in 1645 ordered that the pictures in the royal collection containing representations of the Second Person of the Trinity, or of the Virgin Mary, should be burnt, and that all the other pictures collected by Charles should be sold. Fortunately this very characteristic edict was not fully complied with. Cromwell succeeded in saving the cartoons of Raphael and other less important pictures for England and the world; but a great portion of the art treasures of the King were dispersed. Many of his finest pictures found their way to the Escorial, and a ply which was exceedingly hostile to art was given to a large part of the English people. In order that the artistic capacities of a nation should be largely developed, it is necessary that the great body of the people should come in frequent contact with artistic works, and that there should be institutions securing the means of artistic education. Both of these conditions were wanting in England. In ancient Greece and in modern Florence all classes of the community had the opportunity of becoming familiar with the noblest works of the chisel or of the pencil; their taste was thus gradually educated, and any artistic genius that was latent among them was awakened. But in England by far the greater number of works of art were in private hands, while Sabbatarian prejudices and the division of classes produced by an aristocratic tone of manners, effectually excluded the great mass of the people from the small number of paintings that were in public institutions. Annual exhibitions were as yet unknown.¹ The country habits of the English nobility

¹ According to Pye, the first public exhibition of British Works of Art was about 1740, when Hogarth presented a portrait to the Foundling Hospital,

and other artists followed his example. In 1759 a meeting of artists resolved to establish an annual exhibition, and in the following year they, for the first

turned their tastes chiefly in the direction of field-sports and other outdoor pursuits, and art never occupied the same prominence in their lives as it did in those of the Cardinals of Rome, or of the rich merchants of Florence, Venice, and Amsterdam. The same passion for a country life induced most of those who were real collectors to accumulate their treasures in their country houses, where they were seen only by a few private friends, and were utterly without influence on the nation at large. In the middle of the eighteenth century, England was already very rich in private collections,¹ but the proportion of Englishmen who had ever looked at a good picture or a good statue was very small. Nor were there any means of artistic education.

At Paris the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture was established as early as 1648, and in 1665 Colbert founded that admirable institution, the French Academy at Rome, for the purpose of providing young artists with the best possible instruction. In England nothing of the kind existed, and in the beginning of the eighteenth century a poor student of art could find no assistance except by private patronage. The first two Georges were absolutely indifferent to art, and although a fashion of collecting pictures had spread very widely among the English aristocracy, their patronage was neither generous nor intelligent. It was observed that portrait-painting, which touched another sentiment besides love of pure art, was the only form that was really encouraged. Painter after painter, distinguished in other branches, came over to England, but they invari-

time, carried their intention into effect.—Pye's *Patronage of British Art*, p. 286.

¹ A list of the chief collections in England in 1766 is given in Pye's *Patronage of British Art*, pp. 145, 146, and catalogues of

the chief pictures contained in them will be found in a book called *The English Connoisseur: an account of whatever is curious in painting and sculpture in the palaces and seats of the nobility and gentry of England* (1766).

ably found that they could succeed only by devoting themselves to the one department which appealed directly to the vanity of their patrons.¹ 'Painters of history,' said Kneller, 'make the dead live, but do not begin to live themselves till they are dead. I paint the living, and they make me live.' Hogarth described portrait-painting as 'the only flourishing branch of the high tree of British art.' Barry complained that 'the difficulty of subsisting by any other species of art . . . and the love of ease and affluence had so operated upon our youth that the country had been filled with this species of artist.' The Dutch portrait-painter Vanloo, who came to London in 1737, was so popular that, as a nearly contemporary writer tells us, 'for several weeks after his arrival, the train of carriages at his door was like that at the door of a theatre. He had some hundreds of portraits begun, and was obliged to give as many as five sittings in a day. Large bribes were given by many to the man who kept the register of his engagements, in order to accelerate their sittings, and when that was not done, it was often necessary to wait six

¹ 'No painter, however excellent, can succeed among the English, that is not engaged in painting portraits. Canaletti, whose works they admired whilst he resided at Venice, at his coming to London had not in a whole year the employment of three months. Watteau, whose pictures are sold at such great prices at present, painted never a picture but two which he gave to Dr. Mead, during the time he resided here. At the same time, Vanloo, who came hither with the reputation of painting portraits very well, was obliged to keep three or four subaltern

painters for drapery and other parts.'—Angeloni's *Letters on the English* (2nd ed. 1756), i. 97. So, too, Amiconi, a Venetian historical painter, came to England in 1729, and tried for a time to maintain a position by his own form of art, 'but,' says Horace Walpole, 'as portraiture is the one thing necessary to a painter in this country, he was obliged to betake himself to that employment much against his inclination.'—*Anecdotes of Painting*. See, too, Dallaway's *Progress of the Arts in England*, pp. 455-461.

weeks.' Vanloo remained in England only four years, but is said to have accumulated in that time considerable wealth.¹ On the other hand, it is very remarkable that, in the next generation, Wilson, the first great English landscape-painter, and Barry, the first historical painter of real talent, were both of them unable to earn even a small competence, and both of them died in extreme poverty. Vertue, who died in 1756, carried the art of engraving to considerable perfection, and was followed by Strange, Boydell, and a few other native engravers. Kneller, and afterwards Thornhill, made some attempts in the first quarter of the century to maintain a private academy in England for artistic instruction, but they appear to have met with little encouragement, and the reign of George I. is on the whole one of the darkest periods in the history of English art.

Early in the next reign, however, a painter of great and original genius emerged from obscurity, who, in a low form of art, attained a high, and almost a supreme, perfection. William Hogarth was born in London, of obscure parents, in 1698. His early years were chiefly passed in engraving arms, shop bills, and plates for books. He then painted portraits, some of them of singular beauty, and occasionally furnished designs for tapestry. In 1730 he secretly married the daughter of Sir James Thornhill, the fashionable artist of the day, and in 1731 he completed his 'Harlot's Progress,' which proved to all good judges that, for the first time, a really great native painter had arisen in England. Had his genius been of a higher order, he would probably have been less successful. He had little charm of colouring or sense of beauty, and no power of idealising nature; but his rare gifts of invention and of humour, the intense realism, homeliness and truth of his pictures of English

¹ Rouquet, *L'Etat des Arts en Angleterre*, pp. 59, 60.

life, and the excellent morals they invariably conveyed, appealed to all classes, while their deep and various meaning, and the sombre imagination he sometimes threw over his conceptions,¹ raised them far above the level of the mere grotesque. The popularity of his designs was such that they were immensely imitated, and it was found necessary to pass an Act of Parliament, in 1735, vesting an exclusive right in designers and engravers, and restraining the multiplying of copies of works without the consent of the artist.² In the same reign sculpture in England was largely pursued by Rysbrack, a native of Antwerp, and by Roubiliac, a native of Lyons.

The taste for music was more widely diffused than that for painting; but although it made rapid progress in the first half of the eighteenth century, this was in no degree due to native talent. A distinguished French critic³ has noticed, as one of the most striking of the many differences between the two great branches of the Teutonic race, that, among all modern civilised nations, the Germans are probably the most eminent, and the English the most deficient, in musical talent. Up to the close of the seventeenth century, however, this distinction did not exist, and England might fairly claim a very respectable rank among musical nations. No feature in the poetry of Shakespeare or Milton is more remarkable than the exquisite and delicate appreciation of music they continually evince, and the musical dramas known under the name of masques, which were so popular from the time of Ben Jonson to the time of the Rebellion, kept up a general taste for the art. Henry Lawes, who

¹ See e.g. that noble sketch—the last he ever drew—called ‘Finis.’

² 8 Geo. II. c. 13. Nichols’ *Memoirs of Hogarth*, p. 37.

³ Renan.

composed the music for 'Comus,' as well as edited the poem, and to whom Milton has paid a beautiful compliment,¹ was conspicuous as a composer. Blow, in the last years of the seventeenth century, contributed much to Church music; but the really great name in English music was Henry Purcell, who was born in 1658, and died in 1697, and who, in the opinion of many competent judges, deserves to rank among the very greatest composers who had up to that date arisen in Europe. In the early years of the eighteenth century, however, music was purely an exotic. The capital fact of this period was the introduction and great popularity of the Italian opera. Operas on the Italian model first appeared in England in 1705. They were at first sung in English, and by English performers; but soon after, some Italian castrati having come over, the principal characters in the dialogue sang in Italian, while the subordinate characters answered in English. After two or three years, this absurdity passed away, and the operas became wholly Italian. In 1710 the illustrious Handel first came to England, and 'Rinaldo,' his earliest opera, appeared in 1711. Bononcini, who at one time rivalled his popularity as a composer, followed a few years later. An Academy for Music was founded in 1720, and several Italian singers of the highest merit were brought over, at salaries which were then unparalleled in Europe. The two great female singers, Cuzzoni and La Faustina, obtained each 2,000 guineas

¹ 'But first I must put off
 These my sky-robcs, spun out of Iris' woof,
 And take the weeds and likeness of a swain
 That to the service of this house belongs,
 Who with his soft pipe and smooth-dittied song
 Well knows to still the wild winds when they roar,
 And hush the waving woods.' *Comus.*

Lawes taught music in the house of Lord Bridgewater, where *Comus* was first represented.

a year, Farinelli 1,500 guineas and a benefit, Senesino 1,400 guineas. The rivalry between Cuzzoni and La Faustina, and the rivalry between Handel and Bononcini, divided society into factions almost like those of the Byzantine Empire; and the conflicting claims of the two composers were celebrated in a well-known epigram, which has been commonly attributed to Swift, but which was in reality written by Byrom.¹ The author little imagined that one of the composers, whom he treated with such contempt, was, in his own, and that no ignoble, sphere, among the master intellects of mankind.²

The difficulties against which the new entertainment had to struggle were very great. Addison opposed it bitterly in the 'Spectator.' The partisans of the regular drama denounced it as an absurd and mischievous novelty. It had to encounter the strong popular prejudice against foreigners and Papists. It was weakened by perpetual quarrels of composers and singers, and it was supported chiefly by the small and capricious circle of fashionable society. In 1717 the Italian theatre was closed for want of support, but it revived in 1720 under the auspices of Handel. The extraordinary success of 'The Beggars' Opera,' which appeared in 1728, for a time threw it completely in the shade. The music of Handel was deserted, and the Italian theatre again closed. It reopened in the following year under the joint direction of Handel and of Heidegger, a Swiss, famous for his ugliness, his impudence, and his skill in

¹ 'Some say that Signor Bononcini
Compared to Handel is a ninny;
Others aver that to him Handel
Is scarcely fit to hold a candle.
Strange that such difference should be
'Twixt tweedledum and tweedledee.'

² Burney's *Hist. of Music*. Schölicher's *Life of Handel*. Byrom's *Remains*, vol. i. pt. i. p. 150.

organising public amusements ; and it continued to flourish until a quarrel broke out between Handel and the singer Senesino. The great nobles, who were the chief supporters of the opera, took the side of the singer, set up, in 1733, a rival theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, attracted to it Farinelli and most of the best singers, made it their special object to ruin Handel, and succeeded in so governing the course of fashion that his theatre was almost deserted. The King, it is true, steadily supported him, and Queen Caroline, with the tact she usually showed in discovering the highest talent in the country, threw her whole enthusiasm into his cause ; but the Prince of Wales, who was in violent opposition to his father, took the opposite side, and the Court could not save the great musician from ruin. 'The King and Queen,' says Lord Hervey, 'sat freezing constantly at his empty Haymarket opera, whilst the Prince, with the chief of the nobility, went as constantly to that of Lincoln's Inn Fields.'¹ Handel struggled for some time vainly against the stream ; all the savings he had amassed were lost, and his career was for a time ended by bankruptcy in 1737.

The effect, however, was only to make him turn more exclusively to that nobler and loftier form of music in which he had no rival. Like the great blind poet of Puritanism, whom in more than one respect he resembled, he was indeed one of those whose lips the Seraphim had touched and purified with the hallowed fire from the altar ; and it was only when interpreting the highest religious emotions that his transcendent

¹ Lord Hervey's *Memoirs*, i. 314. The Princess Royal was equally enthusiastic. The King said, with good nature and good sense, 'He did not think setting oneself at the head of a faction of fiddlers a very honourable em-

ployment for people of quality, or the ruin of one poor fellow [Handel] so generous or so good-natured a scheme as to do much honour to the undertakers, whether they succeeded or not.'

genius was fully felt. If it be true that music is in modern art what painting was in the Renaissance and what sculpture was in antiquity, the name of Handel can be placed little below those of Raphael and of Phidias, and it is to his sacred music that his pre-eminence is mainly due. To recall sacred music from the neglect into which it had fallen in England had long been his desire. In 1713 he had composed a grand 'Te Deum' and 'Jubilate' in celebration of the Peace of Utrecht. From 1718 to 1721 he had been organist to the chapel of the Duke of Chandos. He introduced for the first time organ concerts into England; and, in addition to many beautiful anthems, he composed his oratorio of 'Esther' for the Duke of Chandos's chapel. Oratorios had been invented in the middle of the sixteenth century by St. Philip Neri in order to counteract the attractions of the theatre, but they had hitherto been absolutely unknown in England. 'Esther' was brought upon the public stage for the first time in 1732. It was followed in 1733 by 'Deborah' and by 'Athalie,' in 1738 by 'Israel in Egypt,' in 1740 by 'Saul.' The earliest of these great compositions were received with considerable applause, but the last two were almost utterly neglected. The musical education of the public was not sufficient to appreciate them; the leaders of fashion who professed to regulate taste in matters of art steadily and vindictively derided them; and the King and Queen incurred no small ridicule for their persistent admiration of Handel. A story is told of Chesterfield leaving the empty theatre in which an oratorio was being sung before the King, and giving as his reason that he did not desire to intrude on the privacy of his sovereign. Horace Walpole, who assumed the language of a great critic in matters of art, but whose cold heart and feebly fastidious taste were usually incapable of appreciating any high form of excellence,

sneered at Handel, as he afterwards sneered at Garrick ; and it came to be looked upon in fashionable circles as one of the signs of good taste to ridicule his music.¹ Some ladies of position actually engaged a famous mimic and comic singer to set up a puppet-show in the hope of drawing away the people from Handel,² and with the same view they specially selected the days on which an oratorio was performed, for their card parties or concerts.³

There was, of course, a certain party in his favour. Arbuthnot, who was himself an excellent musician, steadily supported him. Pope, though perfectly insensible to the charm of music, resting on the opinion of Arbuthnot, took the same side. A statue of Handel by Roubiliac was erected in Vauxhall in 1738, but of the general depreciation and condemnation of his music there can be no doubt. The death of Queen Caroline, in 1737, deprived him of his warmest patron, and he composed an anthem for her funeral, which Dr. Burney

¹ Fielding has noticed this in a characteristic passage. 'It was Mr. Western's custom every afternoon, as soon as he was drunk, to hear his daughter play on the harpsichord ; for he was a great lover of music, and, perhaps, had he lived in town, might have passed as a connoisseur, for he always excepted against the finest compositions of Mr. Handel ; he never relished any music but what was light and airy ; and, indeed, his most favourite tunes were "Old Sir Simon, the King," "St. George he was for England," "Bobbing Joan," and some others.' — *Tom Jones*.

² See Smollett's poem called 'Advice,' and the accompanying note.

Again shall Handel raise his laurell'd brow,
Again shall harmony with rapture glow !
The spells dissolve, the combination
breaks,
And Punch, no longer Frasi's rival,
squeaks.
Lo, Russel falls a sacrifice to whim,
And starts amazed in Newgate from his
dream.

Line 183.

Russel was a famous mimic and singer set up by certain ladies of quality to oppose Handel. When the current of fashion changed he sank into debt, and was confined in Newgate, where he lost his reason. A small subscription was with difficulty raised among his patronesses to procure his admission into Bedlam.

³ Schölcher.

regarded as the most perfect of all his works. After the bankruptcy of his theatre, and the almost total failure of his last two oratorios, he felt it necessary to bend before the storm, and he resolved for a time to fly where his works 'would be out of the reach of enmity and prejudice.' He had already composed the music for the greatest of all his works, but he would not risk its production in London, and he adopted the resolution of bringing it out for the first time in Dublin.¹

The visit of Handel to Ireland in the December of 1741 has been investigated in all its details,² and it forms a pleasing episode in the Irish history of the eighteenth century. It appears that music had for some time been passionately cultivated in the Irish capital, that a flourishing society had been formed for practising it, and that the music of Handel was already in great favour. It was customary to give frequent concerts for the benefit of Dublin charities, and one of these charities was at this time attracting great attention. The revelation of the frightful abuses in the debtors' prisons in Ireland had made a deep impression, and a society was formed for ameliorating the condition of the in-

¹ 'But soon, ah soon, rebellion will commence
If music meanly borrow aid from sense ;
Strong in new arms, lo ! giant Handel stands
Like bold Briareus, with a hundred hands ;
To stir, to rouse, to shake the soul, he comes ;
And Jove's own thunders follow Mars's drums.
Arrest him, Empress, or you sleep no more.
She heard, and drove him to the Hibernian shore.'

Dunciad, bk. iv.

² See a very curious and interesting little book, called *An Account of the Visit of Handel to Dublin*, by Horatio Townsend (Dublin, 1852). Since this book was published, a little additional light has been thrown on the

stay of Handel in Ireland, by the publication of the letters of Mrs. Delany, who was then living near Dublin, and who was a friend and ardent admirer of Handel. See, too, Burney's *Hist. of Music*, iv. 661, 662.

mates, compounding with their creditors, and releasing as many as possible from prison. In the year 1739 no less than 188 had been freed from a condition of extreme misery, and the charity still continued. It was for the benefit of this and of two older charities¹ that the 'Messiah' of Handel was first produced, in Dublin, in April 1742. In the interval that had elapsed since his arrival in Ireland its composer had abundant evidence that the animosity which had pursued him so bitterly in England had not crossed the Channel. In a remarkable letter dated December 29, written to his friend Charles Jennens,² who had selected the passages of Scripture for the 'Messiah,' Handel describes the success of a series of concerts which he had begun: 'The nobility did me the honour to make amongst themselves a subscription for six nights, which did fill a room of 600 persons, so that I needed not sell one single ticket at the door; and, without vanity, the performance was received with a general approbation. . . . I cannot sufficiently express the kind treatment I receive here, but the politeness of this generous nation cannot be unknown to you, so I let you judge of the satisfaction I enjoy, passing my time with honour, profit, and pleasure.' A new series of concerts was performed with equal success, and on April 8, 1742, the 'Messiah' was rehearsed, and on the 13th it was for the first time publicly performed. The choirs of St. Patrick's Cathedral and of Christ's Church were enlisted for the occasion. Mrs. Cibber and Mrs. Avolio sang the chief parts. The Viceroy, the Archbishop of Dublin, the leading Fellows of Trinity College, and most of the other dignitaries in Church and State, were present, and the success was overwhelming and immediate. The

¹ Mercer's Hospital and the Charitable Infirmary.

country gentleman—a Nonjuror. Townsend, p. 81.

² He was a Leicestershire

Music Hall was so thronged that an advertisement was issued, begging the ladies for the occasion to discard their hoops, and no discordant voice appears to have broken the unanimity of applause. Handel, whose sensitive nature had been embittered by long neglect and hostility, has recorded in touching terms the completeness of his triumph. He remained in Ireland till the following August, a welcome guest in every circle; and he is said to have expressed his surprise and admiration at the beauty of those national melodies which were then unknown out of Ireland, but which the poetry of Moore has, in our own century, carried over the world.

On his return to London, however, he found the hostility against him but little diminished. The 'Messiah,' when first produced in London, if it did not absolutely fail, was but coldly received, and it is shameful and melancholy to relate that in 1745 Handel was for a second time reduced to bankruptcy. The first really unequivocal success he obtained in England for many years was his 'Judas Maccabæus,' which was composed in 1746, and brought out in the following year. It was dedicated to the Duke of Cumberland, and was intended to commemorate his victory at Culloden, and this fact, as well as the enthusiastic support of the London Jews, who welcomed it as a glorification of a great Jewish hero, contributed largely to its success. From this time the current of fashion suddenly changed. When the 'Messiah' was again produced at Covent Garden in 1750 it was received with general enthusiasm, and the 'Te Deum' on the occasion of the victory of Dettingen, and the long series of oratorios which Handel brought out in the closing years of his life, were scarcely less successful. In 1751 he became completely blind, but he still continued to compose music and to play publicly upon the organ. Among

other pieces he performed his own 'Samson,' and while the choir sang to the pathetic strains of Handel those noble lines in which Milton represented the Jewish hero lamenting the darkness that encompassed him, a thrill of sympathetic emotion passed through the crowded audience as they looked upon the old blind musician, who sat before them at the organ.¹ The popularity of his later days restored his fortunes, and he acquired considerable wealth.² He died on Good Friday in 1759, after a residence in England of forty-nine years, and he obtained the well-won honour of a tomb in Westminster Abbey.³

The great impulse given by Handel to sacred music, and the naturalisation of the opera in England, are the two capital events in English musical history during the first half of the eighteenth century. Apart from these musical performances the love for dramatic entertainments appears to have greatly increased, though the theatre never altogether recovered the blow it had received during the Puritan ascendancy. So much has been said of the necessary effect of theatrical amusements in demoralising nations that it is worthy of special notice that there were ten or eleven theatres open in London in the reign of Elizabeth, and a still greater number in the reign of her successor,⁴ whereas in the incomparably more profligate reign of Charles II. there were only two. Even these proved too many, and in spite of the attraction of actresses, who were then for the first time permitted upon the stage, and of the great histrionic powers of Hart and of Betterton, it was found necessary to unite the companies in 1684.⁵

¹ Mrs. Delany's *Correspondence*, iii. 177.

² *Ibid.* iii. 549, 550. He left 20,000*l.*

³ Schölcher's *Life of Handel*. See, too, the *Histories of Music*

by Burney and by Hawkins.

⁴ Compare Collier's *Annals of the Stage*, i. 343. Chalmers' *Account of the Early English Stage*.

⁵ Cibber's *Apology*, ch. iv.

The profligacy of the theatre during the generation that followed the Restoration can hardly be exaggerated, and it continued with little abatement during two reigns. The character of the plays was such that few ladies of respectability and position ventured to appear at the first representation of a new comedy, and those whose curiosity triumphed over their delicacy usually came masked—a custom which at this time became very common, and which naturally led to grave abuses.¹ By the time of the Revolution, however, the movement of dissipation had somewhat spent its force, and the appearance in 1698 of Collier's well-known 'Short View of the Stage' had a sensible and an immediate effect. Though the author was a vehement Nonjuror, William expressed warm approbation of his work, and a royal order was issued to restrain the abuses of the stage. The Master of the Revels, who then licensed plays, began to exercise his function with some severity, and a favourable change passed over public opinion. In the reign of Anne the reformation was much aided by the prohibition of masks in the theatre.² But although a certain improvement was effected, much still remained to be done. Great scandal was caused by a prologue, written by Garth, and spoken at the opening of the Haymarket Theatre in 1705, which congratulated the world that the stage was beginning to take the place of

¹ 'While our authors took these extraordinary liberties with their wit, I remember the ladies were then observed to be decently afraid of venturing barefaced to a new comedy till they had been assured they might do it without the risque of insult to their modesty; or if their curiosity were too strong for their patience, they took care at least to save

appearances, and rarely came upon the first days of acting but in masks (then daily worn, and admitted in the pit, side boxes, and gallery).—Cibber's *Apology*, ch. viii. So Pope :

The fair sat panting at a courtier's play,
And not a mask went unimproved away.
Essay on Criticism, pt. ii.

² See Davies' *Life of Garrick*, ii. 355 (ed. 1780).

the Church.¹ The two Houses of Convocation, in a representation to the Queen in 1711, dwelt strongly on the immorality of the drama.² Swift placed its degraded condition among the foremost causes of the corruption of the age,³ and it is remarkable that although English play-writers borrowed very largely from the French, the English stage was far inferior to that of France in decorum, modesty, and morality. In this respect at least there was no disposition to imitate French manners, and we may, indeed, trace among English writers no small jealousy of the dramatic supremacy of France. Dryden continually expressed it, and Shadwell displayed it in a strain of grotesque insolence. Among his plays was one called 'The Miser,' based upon one of the most perfect of the matchless comedies of Molière. Not content with degrading this noble play by the addition of coarse, obscene, and insipid jests which French taste would never have tolerated, Shadwell prefixed to it a preface in which he gives us with amusing

¹ 'In the good days of ghostly ignorance,
How did cathedrals rise and zeal advance!
The merry monks said orisons at ease,
Large were their meals, and light their penances.
Pardons for sins were purchased with estates,
And none but rogues in rags died reprobates.
But now that pious pageantry's no more,
And stages thrive as churches did before.'

See the *Harleian Miscellany*, ii. 21.

² *Harleian Miscellany*, ii. 21.

³ See some admirable remarks on the subject in his *Project for the Advancement of Religion*, written in 1709. He says: 'It is worth observing the distributive justice of the authors, which is constantly applied to the punishment of virtue and the reward of vice; directly opposite to the rules of their best critics, as well as to the practice of dramatique

poets in all other ages and countries. . . . I do not remember that our English poets ever suffered a criminal amour to succeed upon the stage until the reign of Charles II. Ever since that time the alderman is made a cuckold, the deluded virgin is debauched, and adultery and fornication are supposed to be committed behind the scenes as part of the action.'

candour his own estimate of the comparative merits of Molière and of himself. 'The foundation of this play,' he said, 'I took from one of Molière's, called "L'Avare," but having too few persons and too little action for an English theatre, I added to both so much that I may call more than half this play my own; and I think I may say without vanity that Molière's part of it has not suffered in my hands; nor did I ever know a French comedy made use of by the worst of our poets that was not bettered by them. 'Tis not barrenness of wit or invention that makes us borrow from the French, but laziness, and this was the occasion of my making use of "L'Avare."'¹

Shadwell was a poor poet, but he was for a long time a popular dramatist, and he was sufficiently conspicuous to be appointed poet laureate by William in the place of Dryden. The preface I have cited, coming from such a pen, throws a curious light upon the national taste. Addison and Steele, who contributed in so many ways to turn the stream of fashion in the direction of morality, did something at least to introduce French decorum into the English drama. Both of them wrote plays, which, though of no great merit, had their hour of noisy popularity, and were at least scrupulously moral. 'I never heard of any plays,' said Parson Adams, in one of the novels of Fielding, 'fit for a Christian to read but "Cato" and the "Conscious Lovers," and I must own in the latter there are some things almost solemn enough for a sermon.'² The example, however, was not very generally followed, and

¹ So, too, in the Prologue of the play—

French plays in which true wit's as
rarely found
As mines of silver are in English ground.

* * * * *
For our good-natured nation thinks it fit
To count French toys good wares, French
nonsense wit.

² *Joseph Andrews*, bk. iii. ch. xi. Hallam says: 'Steele's *Conscious Lovers* is the first comedy [after the Restoration] which can be called moral.' *Hist. of Literature*, iv. 284. Hazlitt complains of the too didactic character of the plays of Steele. and says:

some of the comedies of Fielding in point of coarseness are little if at all superior to those of Wycherley. Dr. Herring, who was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, when Court Chaplain and preacher at Lincoln's Inn, denounced the 'Beggar's Opera' of Gay with great asperity from the pulpit;¹ and Sir John Barnard, in 1735, brought the condition of the theatre before the House of Commons, complaining bitterly that there were now six theatres in London, and that they were sources of great corruption. In the course of the debate one of his chief supporters observed 'that it was no less surprising than shameful to see so great a change for the worse in the temper and inclinations of the British nation, who were now so extravagantly addicted to lewd and idle diversions that the number of playhouses in London was double that of Paris . . . that it was astonishing to all Europe that Italian eunuchs and signoras should have set salaries equal to those of the Lords of the Treasury and Judges of England.'² On this occasion nothing effectual was done, but soon after the theatre took a new form which was well calculated to alarm politicians. Fielding, following an example which had been set by Gay, made it the vehicle of political satire, and in his 'Pasquin' and his 'Historical Register' he ridiculed Walpole and the corruption at elections. Another play, called 'The Golden Rump,' submitted to the director of Lincoln's Inn Theatre and handed over by him to the minister, was said to have contained a bitter satire against the King and the reigning family. Walpole, relying on these, carried through Parliament in 1737 a licensing Act

'The comedies of Steele were the first that were written expressly with a view not to imitate the manners but to reform the morals of the age.'—*Lectures on the*

Comic Writers, p. 341.

¹ Swift's *Correspondence*, ii. 243. *Intelligencer*, No. iii.

² *Parl. Hist.* ix. 948.

greatly restricting the number of playhouses, and at the same time authorising the Lord Chamberlain to prohibit any dramatic representation, and providing that no new play or addition to an old play could be acted if he had not first inspected it. The power of the Lord Chamberlain over the theatre was not a new thing, and it had very recently been exercised for the suppression of the sequel to the 'Beggar's Opera' by Gay; but it had hitherto been undefined or very rarely employed, and the institution of an authorised and systematic censorship was opposed by Pulteney, and denounced with especial vehemence by Chesterfield, as the beginning of a crusade against the liberty of the Press. Among the plays that were proscribed under the new system were the 'Gustavus Vasa' of Brooke, and the 'Eleanora' of Thomson; the rising fashion of political comedies was crushed, but in general the licensing power was employed with much moderation and simply in the interests of morality.¹

By far the greatest dramatic success during the first half of the eighteenth century was the 'Beggar's Opera' of Gay. It for a time, as we have seen, ruined the Italian opera; and in one of the notes of the 'Dunciad' we have a curious picture of the enthusiasm it excited. It was acted in London without interruption for sixty-three days, and was received with equal applause in the following season. It was played fifty times in both Bristol and Bath. It spread rapidly through all the great towns of the kingdom, penetrated to Scotland and Wales, and was brilliantly successful in Ireland. Its favourite songs appeared on ladies' fans and on drawing-room screens, and a hitherto obscure actress,

¹ A very full history of Walpole's measure is given in Coxe's *Life*, ch. xlvii. It was ostensibly an Act to amend a law passed under Anne which treated players

who acted without licence as vagrants or vagabonds. See, too, Maty's *Life of Chesterfield*. Lawrence's *Life of Fielding*. *Parl. Debates*.

by playing its principal part, became one of the most conspicuous and popular personages in the country. In general the prevailing taste in dramatic literature during the greater part of this period was very low. The change which had passed over the social position of authors was peculiarly prejudicial to the drama, which consists in a great degree of sketches of the manners of society,¹ and there was little or no demand for plays of a high order. Slight and coarse comedies, or gaudy spectacles with rope dancers and ballets, appear to have been in the greatest favour, and in more serious pieces the love of butchering, so characteristic of the English stage, was long a standing reproach among foreign critics.² Masquerades were at this time extremely popular, and they had a considerable influence over theatrical taste. Heidegger organised them on a magnificent scale, and they were warmly patronised by the King, who was extremely angry with Bishop Gibson for denouncing them. In one celebrated masquerade the King was present in disguise, while the well-known maid of honour, Miss Chudleigh, scandalised all decent persons by appearing almost naked as Iphigenia.³ In 1755, after the earthquake of Lisbon, they were for a short time suppressed, lest they should call down a similar judgment upon London.⁴ The English form of pantomime, which is nearly related to this type of amusement, and which, after more than 150 years,

¹ As Horace Walpole said: 'Why are there so few genteel comedies but because comedies are written by men not of that sphere? Etheridge, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Cibber wrote genteel comedy because they lived in the best company; and Mrs. Oldfield played it so well because she not only followed but often set the fashion.'

—*To the Countess of Ossory*, June 14, 1787.

² *Tatler*, No. 134. *Spectator*, No. 44.

³ Walpole's *Letters to Mann*, May 1749.

⁴ Walpole's *Mem. of George II.* iii. 98. Bedford ascribed the great storm of 1703 to the iniquities of the stage.—Bedford *On the Stage*, p. 26.

retains its popularity, was invented by Rich in 1717.¹ For a few years after the Restoration the acting of Hart and Betterton in some degree supported Shakespeare upon the stage, but a change had taken place in the taste and in the manners of the nation, which made his plays appear barbarous or insipid. Even Dryden, who defended him, only ventured with some timidity to pronounce him to be equal, if not superior, to Ben Jonson.² Evelyn, having been present at a representation of 'Hamlet' in 1661, noticed that 'the old plays began to disgust this refined age since his Majesty had been so long abroad ;'³ and the depreciating or contemptuous language which Pepys employed about nearly every Shakespearian play⁴ that he witnessed probably reflected very fairly the sentiments of the average playgoer. Many of the greatest plays were soon completely banished from the stage, and the few which retained any popularity were re-written, printed under other names, or at least largely altered, reduced to a French standard of correctness, or enlivened with music and dancing. Thus 'Romeo and Juliet' was superseded by the 'Caius Marius' of Otway, 'Measure for Measure' by the 'Law against Lovers' of Davenant, the 'Merry Wives of Windsor' by Dennis's 'Comical Gallant,' 'Richard II.' by Tate's 'Sicilian Usurper,' 'Cymbeline' by Dufey's 'Injured Princess,' 'The Merchant of Venice' by Lord Lansdowne's 'Jew of Venice.' 'Macbeth' was re-cast by Davenant, 'Richard III.' by

¹ Davies' *Life of Garrick*, i. 92, 93. Cibber's *Apology*, ch. xv.

² Dryden's *Essay on Dramatic Poetry*.

³ Evelyn's *Diary*, Nov. 1661.

⁴ He calls *Midsummer Night's Dream* 'the most insipid, ridiculous play' he ever saw; the *Taming of the Shrew* 'a silly

play ;' *Othello* (which he appears at first to have liked), 'a mean thing ;' *Henry VIII.* 'a simple thing made up of many patches,' with nothing good in it 'besides the shows and processions.' *Macbeth* he acknowledged was 'a pretty good play.'

Cibber, 'The Tempest' by both Davenant and Shadwell, 'Coriolanus' by Dennis, and 'King Lear' by Tate.¹

The revolution of taste which gradually reinstated in his ascendancy the greatest writer of England, and perhaps of the world, and made his ideas and language familiar to the upper and middle classes of the nation, is certainly not less worthy of commemoration than any of the military or political incidents of the time. Its effect in educating the English mind can hardly be overrated, and its moral influence was very great. It was partly literary and partly dramatic. The first critical edition of Shakespeare was that of Rowe, which was published in 1709; and, before half the century had passed, it was followed by those of Pope, Theobald, Sir Thomas Hanmer, and Warburton. Dr. Johnson has noticed as a proof of the paucity of readers in the seventeenth century 'that the nation had been satisfied from 1623 to 1664, that is, forty-one years, with only two editions of Shakespeare, which probably did not together make 1,000 copies.'² By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, there had been thirteen editions, and of these, nine had appeared within the last forty years.³ It is obvious from this fact that the interest in Shakespeare was steadily increasing, and that the critical study of his plays was becoming an important department of English literature; and he slowly reappeared in his unaltered form upon the stage. The merit of this revival has often been ascribed almost exclusively to Garrick, but in truth it had begun before, and was a natural reflection of the movement in literature. Six or seven years before the appearance of

¹ Malone's *Historical Account of the English Stage*.

² *Life of Milton*.

³ Knight's *Studies of Shak-*

spcare, p. 141. See, too, Miller's *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, iii. 48, 49; 296, 297.

Garrick, some ladies of rank formed a 'Shakespearian Club' for the purpose of supporting by their presence or encouragement the best plays of Shakespeare.¹ Soon after, revivals became both frequent and successful. In 1737 'King John' was revived at Covent Garden for the first time since the downfall of the stage. In 1738 the Second Part of 'Henry IV.,' 'Henry V.,' and the First Part of 'Henry VI.,' no one of which had been acted for forty or fifty years, were brought upon the stage. In 1740 'As You Like It' was reproduced after an eclipse of forty years, and had a considerable run. In February 1741 the 'Merchant of Venice' was produced in its original form for the first time after one hundred years, and Macklin excited the most enthusiastic applause by his representation of Shylock, who in Lord Lansdowne's version of the play had been reduced to insignificant proportions.² In the same year the 'Winter's Tale' was revived after one hundred years, and 'All's Well that Ends Well' for the first time since the death of Shakespeare; and a monument of the great poet was erected in Westminster Abbey, paid for by the proceeds of special representations at the two great theatres.³ In the October of this year Garrick appeared for the first time on the London stage in the character of Richard III.⁴

The effects of the talent of a great actor are necessarily so extremely evanescent, that it is impossible to

¹ Davies' *Life of Garrick*, ii. 224.

² See an interesting account of this great triumph in Kirkman's *Life of Macklin*, ii. 253-265.

³ Mrs. Delany's *Life*, ii. 139. Pope wrote—

After one hundred and thirty years'
nap
Enter Shakespeare with a loud clap.

⁴ Malone's *Historical Account of the English Stage*, 292-294. The interval that had elapsed since the former acting of each of these plays is given by Malone on the authority of the advertisements, which may not always have been absolutely correct.

compare with much confidence the merits of those who have long passed away. When, however, we consider the extraordinary versatility of the acting of Garrick, and the extraordinary impression which during a long series of years it made upon the most cultivated, as well as upon the most illiterate, it will appear probable that he has never been surpassed in his art—it is certain that he had never been equalled in England since the death of Betterton.¹ The grandson of one of those refugees who had been expelled from France upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he is another of the many instances of the benefits which England has indirectly derived from the intolerance of her neighbours; and in two respects his appearance on the stage has a real importance in the history of the English mind. He was before all things a Shakespearian actor, and he did more than any other single man to extend the popularity and increase the reputation of the great dramatist. He usually gave seventeen or eighteen plays of Shakespeare in a year.² He brought out their beauties with all the skill of a consummate artist, and he at the same time produced a revolution in the art of acting very similar to that which Kent had effected in the art of gardening. A habit of slow, monotonous declamation, of unnatural pomp, and of a total disregard for historic truth in theatrical costume, had become general on the English stage, and the various and rapid intonations of

¹ The impression Betterton made in his day seems to have been not at all less than that made by Garrick. He was buried in Westminster Abbey, and Steele took occasion of his funeral to devote an admirable paper in the *Tatler* to his acting. See, too, Cibber's *Apology*. Cibber pronounced him as supreme among actors as Shakespeare

among poets. A few other particulars relating to him will be found in Galt's *Lives of the Players*. Pope thought Betterton the greatest actor, but said that some old people spoke of Hart as his superior. Betterton died in 1710. Spence's *Anecdotes*.

² Davies' *Life of Garrick*, ii. 114.

Garrick, the careful and constant study of nature and of history which he displayed both in his acting and his accessories, had all the effect of novelty.¹ It is worthy of notice that a similar change both in gardening and in acting took place in France a generation later, and was in a great degree due to the love of nature and the revolt against conventional forms, resulting from the writings of Rousseau. Garrick, like all innovators, had to encounter at first much opposition. Pope and Fielding were warmly in his favour, but the poet Gray declared himself 'stiff in opposition.' Horace Walpole professed himself unable to see the merit of the new performer. Cibber, who had been brought up in the school of Betterton, was equally contemptuous, and the leading actors took the same side. Macklin always spoke of him with the greatest bitterness. Quin, who had for some time held the foremost rank in tragedy, and whose ready wit made him a specially formidable opponent, said, 'If the young fellow is right, I and the rest of the players have been all wrong;' and he added, 'Garrick is a new religion—Whitefield was followed for a time—but they will all come to church again.' Garrick answered in a happy epigram to the effect 'that it was not

¹ See the preliminary dissertation to Foote's *Works*, i. lii, liii. Macklin, who had quarrelled with Garrick, and who cordially detested him, described his acting as 'all bustle.' Macklin's *Memoirs*, i. 248. Fielding's witty description is well known. 'He the best player!' cries Partridge, with a contemptuous sneer, 'why, I could act as well as he myself. I am sure if I had seen a ghost I should have looked in the very same manner and done just as he did. And then, to be sure, in that scene, as you called it, be-

tween him and his mother, when you told me he acted so fine, why, Lord help me! any man—that is, any good man—that has such a mother, would have done exactly the same. I know you are only joking with me, but indeed, Madam, though I was never at a play in London, yet I have seen acting before in the country; and, the King for my money! he speaks all his words distinctly, half as loud again as the other. Anybody may see he is an actor.'—*Tom Jones*. See, too, *The World*, No. 6.

heresy, but reformation.' In two or three characters Quin is said to have equalled him. The Othello of Garrick was a comparative failure, which was attributed to the dark colouring that concealed the wonderful play of his features,¹ and Barry, owing to his rare personal advantages, was, in the opinion of many, superior as Romeo,² but on the whole the supremacy of Garrick was in a few months indisputable, and it continued unshaken during his whole career. At the same time his excellent character, his brilliant qualities, both as a writer and a talker, and the very considerable fortune that he speedily amassed, gave him a social position which had, probably, been attained by no previous actor. The calling of an actor had been degraded by ecclesiastical tradition, as well as by the gross immorality of the theatre of the Restoration. For some time, however, it had been steadily rising,³ and Garrick, while elevating incalculably the standard of theatrical taste, contributed also not a little to free his profession from the discredit under which it laboured. From the time of his first appearance upon the stage till the close of the careers of Kemble, of the elder Kean, and of Miss O'Neil, the English stage was never without some actors who might rank with the greatest on the Continent.

The old Puritanical and ecclesiastical hatred of the theatre had abated, but it was still occasionally shown. In Scotland it completely triumphed, and the attempts of Allan Ramsay and a few others to promote dramatic taste were almost completely abortive.⁴ In England,

¹ Nichols' *Life of Hogarth*, pp. 191, 192.

² Mrs. Montagu's *Letters*, iii. 107.

³ Some particulars of the increase of actors' salaries will be found in Kirkman's *Life of Macklin*, i. 435. Davies' *Life of Garrick*, ii. 239-242.

⁴ Burton's *Hist. of Scotland from the Revolution*, ii. 561. James I., before he ascended the English throne, had come into violent collision with the Puritan ministers, because he tried to procure actors toleration in Scotland.—Collier's *Annals of the Stage*, i. 344-6.

Collier not only censured the gross indecency and immorality of the stage with just severity, but he also contended that it was profane to employ any form of words which was ultimately derived from the Bible, even though it had long since passed into general usage, to use the word 'martyr' in any but its religious sense, to reflect, however slightly, on any priest, not only of a Christian but even of a Pagan creed. In 1719 Arthur Bedford, a chaplain to the Duke of Bedford, published a most curious work 'Against the horrid Blasphemies and Impieties which are still used in English Playhouses . . . showing their plain tendency to overthrow all piety, and advance the interest and honour of the devil in the world; from almost 7,000 instances taken out of the plays of the present century.' He analysed with extraordinary minuteness the whole dramatic literature of the time, and declares that it offended against no less than 1,400 texts of the Bible. He accuses the playwrights, among other things, of restoring the Pagan worship by invoking or giving divine titles to Cupid, Jupiter, Venus, Pluto, and Diana; of indirectly encouraging witchcraft or magic, 'for by bewitching, magick, and enchanting, they only signify something which is most pleasant and desirable;' of encouraging it directly and in the most blasphemous manner by such plays as 'Macbeth' or the 'Tempest.'¹ Like Collier, he finds it

¹ See the long and curious criticism on *Macbeth*. Two passages may be cited as specimens of this singular book. 'When God was pleased to vindicate His own honour, and show that He would not be thus affronted, by sending a most dreadful storm . . . yet, so great was the obstinacy of the stage under such signal judgments, that we are told the actors did in a few

days after entertain again their audience with the ridiculous plays of the *Tempest* and *Macbeth*, and that at the mention of the chimneys being blown down the audience were pleased to clap at an unusual length . . . as if they would outbrave the judgment, throw Providence out of the chair, place the devil in His stead, and provoke God once more to plead His own cause by

very criminal to place an immoral sentiment in the mouth of an immoral character, or a Pagan sentiment in the mouth of a Pagan speaker; and he was able to discover blasphemy even in the 'Cato' of Addison.¹ About thirty years later, William Law published his well-known treatise 'On the Absolute Unlawfulness of the Stage,' in which he maintained that 'the business of players is the most wicked and detestable profession in the world;' 'that the playhouse, not only when some very profane play is on the stage, but in its daily, common entertainments, is as certainly the house of the devil as the church is the house of God;' and that in going to the theatre 'you are as certainly going to the devil's triumph as if you were going to those old sports where people committed murder and offered Christians to be devoured by wild beasts.' In 1769, during the Shakespeare Jubilee, when Garrick was acting at Stratford-on-Avon, the populace of that town are said to have regarded him as a magician, and to have attributed to the vengeance of Heaven the heavy rains that fell during the festival.² But, on the whole, the religious prejudice against the theatre in the first sixty years of the eigh-

sending a greater calamity' (p. 26). 'In another play . . . the high-priest sings—

By the spirit in this wand,
Which the silver moon commands,
By the powerful God of Night,
By the love of Amphitrite.

(By the mystery of Thy holy incarnation (which was to destroy the works of the devil); by Thy holy nativity and circumcision; by Thy baptism, fasting, and temptation; by Thine agony and bloody sweat; by Thy cross and passion; by Thy precious death and burial; by Thy glorious resurrection and ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost,

good Lord, deliver us from such impieties as these!') (p. 16).

¹ 'Our blessed Saviour . . . hath these words: "This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." Upon the stage, an actor, finding that his mistress loves him, saith—

This, this is life indeed! Life worth preserving!
Such life as Juba never felt till now!

And a little after—

My joy! My best beloved! My only wish!

² Davies' *Life of Garrick*, ii.

226, 227.

teenth century was probably much less strong than it afterwards became, through the influence of the Methodists and the Evangelicals. The strength which it at last acquired among large classes is much to be regretted. It has prevented an amusement which has added largely to the sum of human happiness, and which exercises a very considerable educational influence, from spreading anywhere except in the greatest centres of population. It has multiplied proportionately amusements of a far more frivolous and purely unintellectual character, and it has withdrawn from the audiences in the theatre the very classes whose presence would be the best guarantee of the habitual morality of the entertainment.

The decline of one other class of amusements must be briefly noticed, for it forms a curious page in the history of national manners. Up to the time of the Rebellion the baiting of animals, and especially of bulls and bears, was a favourite pastime with every class. Henry VIII., Mary, Elizabeth, and James I. had all encouraged it; but under Elizabeth the growing taste for theatrical representations had begun gradually to displace it, and to give a new ply and tone to the manners of the rich. All forms of amusement naturally fell into desuetude during the Civil War. All of them were suppressed during the Commonwealth, and it was probably some Puritan divines who first maintained in England the doctrine that it was criminal to make the combative or ferocious instincts of animals subservient to our pleasures.¹ Motives of humanity had, however, in general little or nothing to say to the Puritanical proscription of these amusements, which, as Macaulay truly

¹ See a very curious collection of Puritan denunciations of cock-fighting, on the ground that 'the antipathy and cruelty that one

beast sheweth to another is the fruit of our rebellion against God,' in the *Harleian Miscellany*, vi. 125-127.

said, were condemned not because they gave pain to the animal, but because they gave pleasure to the spectators.¹ When, however, they revived at the Restoration, the change of tastes that had taken place became apparent. The bear-garden was as popular as ever with the poor, but the upper classes had begun to desert it. In 1675 we find a Court exhibition before the Spanish Ambassador, and in 1681 the Ambassador of Morocco and the Duke of Albemarle witnessed a similar spectacle, but such entertainments were now becoming rare. Pepys and Evelyn speak of them as 'rude and nasty pleasures,' 'butcherly sports, or rather barbarous cruelties ;'² and, although even in the last years of the seventeenth century we find a writer on this subject asserting that bull-baiting 'is a sport the English much delight in, and not only the baser sort but the greatest lords and ladies,'³ it is clear that the stream of fashion had decidedly turned. In the beginning of the eighteenth century the essay-writers, who exercised so great an influence on the minor morals of society, steadily discountenanced these amusements ; and we may at this period find several slight, but clear traces of a warmer regard for the sufferings of the lower animals. Steele speaks of the bear-garden as a place 'where reason and good manners had no right to enter,' and both he and Pope wrote in the strongest terms against cruelty to animals, and especially against the English passion for brutal amusements.⁴

¹ See Macaulay's account, *Hist.* ch. ii., and the famous bear-baiting scene in *Hudibras*.

² Pepys' *Diary*, Aug. 14, 1666. Evelyn's *Diary*, June 16, 1670.

³ John Houghton's 'Collections for the Improvement of Agriculture' (1694), quoted in Malcolm's *Anecdotes of London*, iii. 57. As late as 1749, Chet-

wood, in his *History of the Stage*, says : 'Bull-baiting, boxing, bear-gardens, and prize-fighting will draw to them all ranks of people from the peer to the pedlar' (p. 60). They had, however, at this time quite passed out of the category of recognised fashionable amusements.

⁴ *Spectator*, No. 141. *Tatler*,

The practice of vivisection, which is at all times liable to grave abuse, and which, before the introduction of anæsthetics, was often inexpressibly horrible, appears to have been very common.¹ Bacon had recommended inquirers to turn their attention in this direction; and the great discovery, partly through its means, of the circulation of the blood, in the beginning of the seventeenth century, had brought it into fashion; but Pope spoke of it with extreme detestation,² and Johnson, several years later, dwelt with just indignation upon the useless barbarities of which some medical students were guilty.³ The poems of Gay are animated by a remarkable feeling of compassion for animals,⁴ and the Duke of Montague is said to have established a home for them, and to have exerted his influence as a great landlord warmly in their favour.⁵

No. 134. *Guardian*, No. 61 (by Pope). See, too, the *World*, No. 190.

¹ See, on the vivisection of dogs, Coventry's *Pompey the Little*, part iii. ch. xi. The author adds: 'A dog might have been the emblematic animal of Æsculapius or Apollo with as much propriety as he was of Mercury; for no creatures, I believe, have been of more eminent service to the healing tribe than dogs. Incredible is the number of these animals which have been sacrificed at the shrines of physic and surgery. Lectures of anatomy subsist by their destruction. Ward (says Pope) tried his drops on puppies and the poor; and in general, all new medicines and experiments of a doubtful nature are sure to be made in the first place on the bodies of those unfortunate animals.' Swift, in one of his *Drapier's Letters*, compares the threats and

complaints of Wood 'to the last howls of a dog dissected alive, as I hope he hath sufficiently been.' Letter 4.

² Spence's *Anecdotes*, sec. viii.

³ 'Among the inferior professors of medical knowledge is a race of wretches, whose lives are only varied by varieties of cruelty; whose favourite amusement is to nail dogs to tables and open them alive; to try how long life may be continued in various degrees of mutilation or with the excision or laceration of the vital parts; to examine whether burning irons are felt more acutely by the bone or tendon, and whether the more lasting agonies are produced by poison forced into the mouth or injected into the veins.'—*The Idler* (No. 17), 1758.

⁴ See especially his poem on field sports.

⁵ Spence's *Anecdotes*, Supplement.

At the same time the change was only in a small section of the community. Bear-baiting, when it ceased to be an amusement of the rich, speedily declined because of the scarcity of the animals, but bull-baiting through the whole of the eighteenth century was a popular English amusement. In Queen Anne's time it was performed in London at Hockley Hole, regularly twice a week,¹ and there was no provincial town to which it did not extend. It was regarded on the Continent as peculiarly English. The tenacity of the English bull-dog, which would sometimes suffer itself to be cut to pieces rather than relax its hold, was a favourite subject of national boasting, while French writers pointed to the marked difference in this respect between the French and English taste as a conclusive proof of the higher civilisation of their own nation.² Among those who at a late period patronised or defended bull-baiting were Windham and Parr; and even Canning and Peel opposed the measure for its abolition by law. At Stamford and at Tutbury a maddened bull was, from a very early period, annually hunted through the streets. Among the entertainments advertised in London in 1729 and 1730, we find 'a mad bull to be dressed up with fireworks and turned loose in the game place, a

¹ 'Experienced men inured to city ways,
Need not the calendar to count their days.
When through the town, with slow and solemn air,
Led by the nostril, walks the muzzled bear,
Behind him moves, majestically dull,
The pride of Hockley Hole, the surly bull.
Learn hence the periods of the week to name:
Monday and Thursday are the days of game.'

Gay's *Trivia*.

² *Tatler*, No. 134. *Guardian*, No. 61. 'The bear-garden,' says Lord Kames, 'which is one of the chief entertainments of the English, is held in abhorrence by the French, and other polite

nations.'—*Essays on Morality* (1st ed.), p. 7. Hogarth introduced into his picture of a cock-fight, a Frenchman turning away with an expression of unqualified disgust.

dog to be dressed up with fireworks over him, a bear to be let loose at the same time, and a cat to be tied to the bull's tail, a mad bull dressed up with fireworks to be baited.'¹ Such amusements were mingled with prize-fighting, boxing matches between women, or combats with quarter-staffs or broadswords. Ducking-ponds, in which ducks were hunted by dogs, were favourite popular resorts around London, especially those in St. George's Fields, the present site of Bethlehem Hospital. Sometimes the amusement was varied, and an owl was tied to the back of the duck, which dived in terror till one or both birds were killed. The very barbarous amusement of cock-throwing, which was at least as old as Chaucer, and in which Sir T. More when a young man had been especially expert, is said to have been peculiarly English.² It consisted of tying a cock to a stake as a mark for sticks, which were thrown at it from a distance till it was killed; and it was ascribed to the English antipathy to the French, who were symbolised by that bird.³

The old Greek game of cock-fighting was also extremely popular in England. It was a favourite game of schoolboys, who, from the time of Henry II. till the latter part of the eighteenth century, were accustomed almost universally to practise it on Shrove Tuesday; and in many schools in Scotland the runaway cocks were claimed by the masters as their perquisites.

¹ Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, p. 60. Strutt's *Sports and Pastimes*, p. 259.

² There is, however, a picture representing a Dutch fair, in the gallery at the Hague, where a goose is represented undergoing a similar fate.

³ See, on these sports, Strutt's *Sports and Pastimes of the Eng-*

lish People. Collier's *Hist. of the Drama*. Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*. Chambers' *Book of Days*. Hone's *Everyday Book*. Milson's *Travels in England*. Muralt's *Letters on England*. One famous bear, called Sacher-son, is immortalised by Shakespeare, *Merry Wives of Windsor*, act. i. scene i.

A curious account is preserved of the parish of Applecross in Ross-shire, written about 1790, in which among the different sources of the schoolmaster's income we find 'cock-fight dues, which are equal to one quarter's payment for each scholar.'¹ Henry VIII. built a cock-pit at Whitehall; and James I. was accustomed to divert himself with cock-fighting twice a week. In the eighteenth century it appears to have rather increased than diminished, and being the occasion of great gambling it retained its place among very fashionable amusements; nor does it appear to have been generally regarded as more inhuman than hunting, coursing, or shooting. It was introduced into Scotland at the close of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century by a fencing master named Machrie, who seems to have been looked upon as a benefactor to Scotland for having started a new, cheap, and innocent amusement. He wrote, in 1705, 'An Essay on the Innocent and Royal Recreation and Art of Cocking,' in which he expressed his hope that 'in cock-war village may be engaged against village, city against city, kingdom against kingdom, nay, the father against the son, until all the wars of Europe, wherein so much innocent Christian blood is spilt, be turned into the innocent pastime of cocking.'² The fiercest and most powerful cocks were frequently brought over from Germany; and the Welsh main, which was the most sanguinary form of the amusement, appears to have been exclusively English, and of modern origin. In this game as many as sixteen cocks were sometimes matched against each other at each side, and they fought till all on one side were killed. The victors were then divided and fought, and the process was repeated till but a single cock remained. County engaged county in cocking matches, and the church

¹ Chambers' *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, iii. 269.

² *Ibid.* pp. 267, 268.

bells are said to have been sometimes rung in honour of the victor in the Welsh main.¹

The passion for inland watering-places was at its height. Bath, under the long rule of Beau Nash, fully maintained its old ascendancy, and is said to have been annually visited by more than 8,000 families. Anstey, in one of the most brilliant satirical poems of the eighteenth century, painted, with inimitable skill, its follies and its tastes; and the arbitrary but not unskilful sway and self-important manners, of its great master of the ceremonies, were widely celebrated in verse and prose. Among the commands which he issued there is one which is well worthy of a passing notice. Between 1720 and 1730 it was observed that young men of fashion in London had begun in their morning walks to lay aside their swords, which were hitherto looked upon as the indispensable signs of a gentleman, and to carry walking-sticks instead. Beau Nash made a great step in the same direction by absolutely prohibiting swords within his dominions, and this was, perhaps, the beginning of a change of fashion which appears to have been general about 1780, and which has a real historical importance as reflecting and sustaining the pacific habits that were growing in society.² In addition to Bath, Tunbridge Wells, Epsom, Buxton, and the more modest

¹ Roberts' *Social Hist. of the Southern Counties*, p. 421. The history of cock-fighting and cock-throwing has been fully examined in a dissertation by Pegge, in the *Archæologia*, vol. iii.; in Beckmann's *Hist. of Inventions*, vol. ii.; and in Strutt's *Sports and Pastimes*. See, too, Macky's *Tour through England*, i. 137; Heath's account of the Scilly Islands, *Pinkerton's Voyages*, ii. 756. Wesley tells a

story of a gentleman whom he reproved for swearing, and who was at last so mollified that he said 'he would come to hear him, only he was afraid he should say something against fighting of cocks.'—Wesley's *Journal*, March 1743.

² See a curious passage from 'The Universal Spectator,' of 1730, quoted in the *Pictorial Hist. of England*, iv. 805. *Beau Nash's Life*, by Doran. Doran's

Islington retained their popularity, and a new rival was rising into note. The mineral springs of Cheltenham were discovered about 1730, and in 1738 a regular Spa was built. Sea-bathing in the first half of the eighteenth century is very rarely noticed. Chesterfield, indeed, having visited Scarborough in 1733, observed that it was there commonly practised by both sexes,¹ but its general popularity dates only from the appearance of the treatise by Dr. Richard Russell 'On glandular consumption, and the use of sea-water in diseases of the glands,' which was published in Latin in 1750, and translated in 1753. The new remedy acquired an extraordinary favour, and it produced a great, permanent, and on the whole very beneficial change in the national tastes. In a few years obscure fishing-villages along the coast began to assume the dimensions of stately watering-places, and before the century had closed Cowper described, in indignant lines, the common enthusiasm with which all ages and classes rushed for health or pleasure to the sea.²

There was not, I think, any other change in the history of manners during the first sixty years of the

article on Beau Nash, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Townsend's *Hist. of the House of Commons*, ii. 412-416. The evils resulting from the prevailing fashion of wearing swords, had been noticed in the beginning

of the century in a treatise on the subject by a writer named Povey.

¹ *Suffolk Correspondence*, ii. 61. See, too, a passage from 'The Universal Spectator,' for 1732, quoted in Stone's *Chronicles of Fashion*, ii. 274.

² 'Your prudent grandmamas, ye modern belles,
Content with Bristol, Bath, and Tunbridge Wells,
When health required it, would consent to roam,
Else more attached to pleasures found at home;
But now alike, gay widow, virgin, wife,
Ingenuous to diversify dull life,
In coaches, chaises, caravans, and hoys,
Fly to the coast for daily, nightly joys,
And all, impatient of dry land, agree
With one consent to rush into the sea.'

Retirement

eighteenth century, so considerable as to call for extended notice in a work like the present. The refinements of civilisation advanced by slow and almost insensible degrees into country life as the improvements of roads increased the facilities of locomotion, and as the growth of provincial towns and of a provincial press multiplied the centres of intellectual and political activity. In these respects, however, the latter half of the century was a far more memorable period than the former half; and the history of roads, which I have not yet noticed, will be more conveniently considered in a future chapter. The manners and tastes of the country gentry were often to the last degree coarse and illiterate, but the large amount of public business that in England has always been thrown upon the class, maintained among them no contemptible level of practical intelligence; and some circulation of intellectual life was secured by the cathedral towns, the inland watering-places, and the periodical migrations of the richer members to London or Bath. The yeomanry class, also, as long as they existed in considerable numbers, maintained a spirit of independence in country life which extended even to the meanest ploughman, and had some influence both in stimulating the faculties, and restraining the despotism of the country magistrates.¹ Whatever may have been the defects of the English country gentry, agriculture under their direction had certainly attained a much higher perfection than in France,² and though narrow-minded and intensely prejudiced, they formed an upright, energetic, and patriotic element in English public life.

¹ Defoe has noticed this independence in lines more remarkable for their meaning than for their form.

The meanest English plowman studies
law,
And keeps thereby the magistrates in
awe;

Will boldly tell them what they ought
to do,
And sometimes punish their omissions
too.

True-born Englishman.

² See the comparison in Arthur Young's *Tour in France*.

The well-known pictures of Sir Roger de Coverley and of Squire Western exhibit in strong lights their merits and their faults, and the contrast between rural and metropolitan manners was long one of the favourite subjects of the essayists.

That contrast, however, was rapidly diminishing. In the first half of the eighteenth century, the habit of making annual visits to London or to a watering-place very greatly increased, and it contributed at once to soften the manners of the richer and to accelerate the disappearance of the poorer members of the class. A scale and rivalry of luxury passed into country life which made the position of the small landlord completely untenable. At the beginning of the century there still existed in England numerous landowners with estates of 200*l.* or 300*l.* a year. The descendants in many cases of the ancient yeomen, they ranked socially with the gentry. They possessed to the full extent the pride and prejudices, and discharged very efficiently many of the duties of the class; but they lived exclusively in the country, their whole lives were occupied with country business or country sports, their travels rarely or never extended beyond the nearest county town, and in tastes, in knowledge, and in language they scarcely differed from the tenant-farmer. From the early years of the eighteenth century this class began rapidly to diminish, and even before the war of the American Revolution they had become very rare.¹ Though still vehement Tories, full

¹ This change is well noticed in a very able book published in 1772. The author says: 'An income of 200*l.* or 300*l.* a year in the last age was reckoned a decent hereditary patrimony, or a good establishment for life; but now . . . all country gentlemen give in to so many local expenses, and

reckon themselves so much on a par, that a small estate is but another word for starving; of course, few are to be found, but they are bought up by greater neighbours or become mere farmers.'—*Letters on England*, p. 229.

of zeal for the Church and of hatred of Dissenters and foreigners, the Jacobitism of the country gentry had subsided during the reign of George II., and they gave the Pretender no assistance in 1745. Their chief vice was hard-drinking.¹ Their favourite occupations were field sports. These amusements, though they somewhat changed their character, do not appear to have at all diminished during the first half of the eighteenth century, and it was in this period that Gay, and especially Somerville, published the most considerable sporting poems in the language. Hawking, which had been extremely popular in the beginning of the seventeenth century, and which was a favourite sport of Charles II., almost disappeared in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Stag-hunting declined with the spread of agriculture, but hare-hunting held its ground, and fox-hunting greatly increased. Cricket, which would occupy a distinguished place in any modern picture of English manners, had apparently but just arisen. The earliest notice of it, discovered by an antiquary who has devoted much research to the history of amusements, is in one of D'Urfey's songs, written in the beginning of the century.² It was mentioned as one of the amusements of Londoners by Strype in his edition of Stow's 'Survey' published in 1720, and towards the close of the century it greatly increased.

¹ Mrs. Montagu, in one of her letters from Yorkshire to a friend in London, writes: 'We have not been troubled with any visitors since Mr. Montagu went away; and could you see how awkward, how absurd, how uncouth are the generality of people in this country, you would look upon this as no small piece of good fortune. For the most part they are drunken and vicious, and worse than hypocrites—profligates. I

am very happy that drinking is not within our walls. We have not had one person disordered with liquor since we came down, though most of the poor ladies in the neighbourhood have had more hogs in their drawing-room than ever they had in their hog sty.'—Doran's *Life of Mrs. Montagu*, p. 36.

² Strutt's *Sports and Pastimes*, p. 106.

There had been loud complaints ever since the Revolution, both in the country and in the towns, of the rapid rise of the poor-rates, but it seems to have been due, much less to any growth of real poverty than to improvident administration and to the dissipated habits that were generated by the poor-laws. Although the controversy on the subject of these laws did not come to a climax till long after the period we are now considering, the great moral and economical evils resulting from them were clearly seen by the most acute thinkers. Among others, Locke, in a report which he drew up in 1697, anticipating something of the later reasoning of Malthus, pointed out forcibly the danger to the country from the great increase of able-bodied pauperism, and attributed it mainly, if not exclusively, to 'the relaxation of discipline and the corruption of manners.' The annual rates in the last thirty years of the seventeenth century were variously estimated at from 600,000*l.* to 840,000*l.* They rose before the end of the reign of Anne to at least a million. They again sank for a time after an Act, which was carried in 1723, for founding workhouses and imposing a more severe discipline on paupers, but they soon regained their ascending movement and continued steadily to increase during the remainder of the century. Popular education and the rapid growth of manufacturing wages had not yet produced that high type of capacity and knowledge which is now found among the skilled artisans of the great towns, but the broad lines of the English industrial character were clearly discernible. Probably no workman in Europe could equal the Englishman in physical strength, in sustained power and energy of work, and few, if any, could surpass him in thoroughness and fidelity in the performance of his task and in general rectitude and honesty of character. On the other hand, he was far inferior to most continental workmen in those branches of labour which depended

on taste and on delicacy of touch, and most industries of this kind passed into the hands of refugees. His requirements were much greater than those of the continental workman. In habits of providence and of economy he ranked extremely low in the industrial scale; his relaxations usually took the form of drunkenness or brutal sports, and he was rather peculiarly addicted to riot and violence. An attempt to estimate with any precision the position of the different classes engaged in agriculture or manufacturing industry is very difficult, not only on account of the paucity of evidence we possess, but also on account of the many different and fluctuating elements that have to be considered. The prosperity of a class is a relative term, and we must judge it not only by comparing the condition of the same class in different countries and in different times, but also by comparing it with that of the other sections of society. The value of money has greatly changed,¹ but the change has not been uniform; it has been counteracted by other influences; it applies much more to some articles of consumption than to others, and therefore affects very unequally the different classes in the community. Thus the price of wheat in the seventy years that followed the Revolution was not very materially different from what it now is, and during the first half

¹ It is worthy of notice that the complaints of the increasing price of living in the first half of the eighteenth century were, among the upper classes, little less loud than those we hear in the present day. Thus the author of *Faction Detected by the Evidence of Facts*, which was published in 1743, speaking of the royal income at different periods of English history, says: 'King William and Queen Anne had

700,000*l.* per annum, but neither had any family to provide for, and both lived in times when that income would have supported a greater expense than a million would do now; for the truth of which I appeal to the experience of every private family, and to the known advance of price in all commodities and articles of expense whatsoever' (p. 137).

of the eighteenth century it, on the whole, slightly declined. At the time of the Revolution it was a little under 41s. a quarter. During the ten years ending in 1705 it was about 43s., in the ten ending in 1715 it was about 44s.; in the twenty ending in 1735 about 35s.; in the ten ending in 1745 about 32s.; and in the ten ending in 1755 about 33s. The price of meat, on the other hand, was far less than at present. The average price of mutton throughout England from 1706 to 1730 is stated to have been $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ a pound. From 1730 to 1760 it had risen to $3d.$ a pound. The price of beef, from 1740 to 1760, is said to have been $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ a pound. Pork, veal, and lamb, as well as beer, were proportionately cheap.¹ We must remember, too, in estimating the condition of British labourers, that besides their wages they had the advantage of an immense extent of common land. Nearly every village had still around it a large space of uninclosed ground on which the cows, sheep, and geese of the poor found an ample pasture.

The different parts of England differed widely in prosperity, the counties surrounding London, and generally the southern half of the island, being by far the most flourishing, while the northern parts, and especially the counties bordering on Scotland, were the most poor. There can be no doubt that, at least in the more prosperous parts of England, the condition of the labourer was much above the general level of the same class on the Continent. Gregory King, in his very valuable estimate of 'the state and condition of England' in 1696, has calculated that, out of a population of about 5,500,000, about 2,700,000 ate meat daily, and that, of the remaining 2,800,000, 1,540,000 ate meat at least

¹ These and many other statistics on the subject are collected in Knight's *Pictorial Hist. of England*, iv. 700. Eden's

Hist. of the Working Classes, iii. append. i. Thornton's *Over-Population*, p. 202.

twice a week, while 240,000 were either sick persons or infants under thirteen months old. There remained 1,020,000 persons 'who receive alms, and consequently eat not flesh above once a week.' It would appear from this estimate that the whole population ate meat at least once a week, and all healthy adults, who were not paupers, more than once;¹ while the gigantic consumption of beer, to which I have already referred, makes it almost certain that this was the common beverage of all classes. The same writer makes a curious attempt to estimate the average incomes of families in the different classes of society in 1688.

¹ The immense proportion the paupers bore to the rest of the population will strike the reader; but Macaulay, in his famous third chapter, greatly exaggerated its significance as indicating the amount of real misery in the community. The relief was outdoor relief; there appears to have been no general feeling of shame about accepting it, and it was distributed with a most mischievous profusion. Richard Dunning, in a tract published in 1698, asserts that the parish pay was in fact three times as much as a common labourer, having to maintain a wife and three children, can afford to expend upon himself, and that 'persons once receiving parish pay presently become idle, alleging that the parish is bound to maintain them, and that in case they should work, it would only favour a parish from whom, they say, they shall have no thanks.' He assures us that 'such as are maintained by the parish pay, seldom drink any other than the strongest ale-house beer, which, at the rate

they buy it, costs 50s. or 3l. a hogshead; that they seldom eat any bread save what is made of the finest wheat flour.' At this time there is reason to believe that wheat bread was almost unused among the labouring poor. The formation of work-houses in 1723 was of some advantage, but the diet of their inmates was most imprudently and indeed absurdly liberal. See Thornton's *Over-Population*, pp. 205-207. Knight's *Pictorial History*, iv. 841. Macaulay's picture of the condition of the poor should be compared with the admirable chapter on the same subject in Mr. Thornton's *Over-Population*. See, too, his *Labour*, pp. 11, 12. The annual expenditure in poor rates is said to have trebled between the close of the reign of Anne and the year 1750 (Macpherson, *Hist. of Commerce*, iii. 560); yet nearly all the evidence we possess seems to show that the prosperity of the country had during that period been steadily increasing.

That of the temporal lords he places at 2,800*l.*; that of baronets at 880*l.*; that of esquires and of other gentlemen respectively at 450*l.* and 280*l.*; that of shopkeepers and tradesmen at 45*l.*; that of artisans and handicrafts at 40*l.*; that of labouring people and out-servants at 15*l.*; that of common soldiers at 14*l.*; that of cottagers and paupers at 6*l.* 10*s.* The average annual incomes of all classes he reckoned at 32*l.* a family, or 7*l.* 18*s.* a head. In France he calculated that the average annual income was 6*l.* a head, and in Holland 8*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.* From a careful comparison of the food of the different nations he calculated that the English annually spent on food, on an average, 3*l.* 16*s.* 5*d.* a head; the French, 2*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.*; the Dutch, 2*l.* 16*s.* 5*d.*¹

Such estimates can, of course, only be accepted with much reservation; but they are the judgments of a very acute contemporary observer, and they are, no doubt, sufficiently accurate to enable us to form a fair general conception of the relative proportions. In 1704 an abortive attempt which was made to extend the system of poor-law relief produced the 'Giving Alms no Charity,' one of the most admirable of the many excellent tracts of Defoe. No man then living was a shrewder or more practical observer, and he has collected many facts which throw a vivid light on the condition of the labouring poor. He states that although in Yorkshire, and generally in the bishopric of Durham, a labourer's weekly wages might be only 4*s.*, yet in Kent and in several of the southern and western counties agricultural weekly wages were 7*s.*, 9*s.*, and even 10*s.* He mentions the case of a tilemaker, to whom he had for several years

¹ This curious work is printed in full at the end of the later editions of Chalmers' *Estimate*. Macaulay, as will be seen, has much overcharged his picture of

the wretchedness of the poor when he states, on the authority of King, that 'hundreds of thousands of families scarcely knew the taste of meat.'

paid from 16s. to 20s. a week, and states that journey-men weavers could earn from 15s. to 20s. a week. The pauperism of the country he ascribes not to any want of employment, but almost wholly to habits of vagrancy, drunkenness, and extravagance. 'I affirm,' he says, 'of my own knowledge, that when I wanted a man for labouring work, and offered 9s. per week to strolling fellows at my door, they have frequently told me to my face that they could get more a-begging.' 'Good husbandry,' he adds, 'is no English virtue . . . it neither loves, nor is beloved by, an Englishman. The English get estates and the Dutch save them; and this observation I have made between foreigners and Englishmen—that where an Englishman earns his 20s. a week, and but just lives, as we call it, a Dutchman grows rich, and leaves his children in very good condition. Where an English labouring man, with his 9s. a week, lives wretchedly and poor, a Dutchman, with that wages, will live tolerably well. . . . We are the most lazy, diligent nation in the world. There is nothing more frequent than for an Englishman to work till he has got his pockets full of money, and then go and be idle, or perhaps drunk, till it is all gone, and perhaps himself in debt; and ask him, in his cups, what he intends, he'll tell you honestly he will drink as long as it lasts, and then go to work for more. I make no difficulty to promise, on a short summons, to produce above a thousand families in England, within my particular knowledge, who go in rags, and their children wanting bread, whose fathers can earn their 15s. to 25s. a week, but will not work. . . . The reason why so many pretend to want work is that, as they can live so well on the pretence of wanting work, they would be mad to have it and work in earnest.' He maintains that wages in England were higher than in any other country in Europe, that hands and not employment were wanting,

and that the condition of the labour market was clearly shown by the impossibility of obtaining a sufficient number of recruits for the army, without resorting to the press-gang. When, a few years later, the commercial treaty between France and England was discussed, one of the strongest arguments of its opponents was the danger of French competition, on account of the much greater cheapness of French labour. 'The French,' said one of the writers in the 'British Merchant,' 'did always outdo us in the price of labour; their common people live upon roots, cabbage, and other herbage; four of their large provinces subsist entirely upon chestnuts, and the best of them eat bread made of barley, millet, Turkey and black corn . . . they generally drink nothing but water, and at best a sort of liquor they call *beuverage* (which is water passed through the husks of grapes after the wine is drawn off); they save a great deal upon that account, for it is well known that our people spend half of their money in drink.'¹

As far as we are able to judge from the few scattered facts that are preserved, the position of the poor seems on the whole to have steadily improved in the long pacific period during the reigns of George I. and George II. It was at this time that wheat bread began to supersede, among the labouring classes, bread made of rye, barley, or oats, and the rate of wages slightly advanced without any corresponding, or at least equi-

¹ *British Merchant*, i. 6, 7. 'I think nothing so terrible,' wrote Lady M. Montagu, when travelling through France in 1718, 'as objects of misery, except one had the Godlike attribute of being capable to redress them; and all the country villages of France show nothing else. When the post-horses are

changed, the whole town comes out to beg, with such miserable starved faces and thin tattered clothes, they need no other eloquence to persuade one of the wretchedness of their condition.' —Lady M. W. Montagu's *Works* (Lord Wharnccliffe's edition), ii. 89.

valent, rise in the price of the articles of first necessity. When Arthur Young investigated the agricultural condition of the southern counties in 1768, he found that the average weekly rate of agricultural wages for the whole year round, was 10s. 9d. within 20 miles of London; 7s. 8d. at a distance of from 20 to 60 miles from London; 6s. 4d. at from 60 to 110 miles from London; 6s. 3d. at from 110 to 170 miles. The highest wages were in the eastern counties, the lowest in the western counties, and especially in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire. In some parts of these he found that the agricultural wages were not higher than 4s. 6d. in winter and 6s. in summer. In the north of England, which he described in 1770, he found that agricultural wages, for the whole year, ranged from 4s. 11d. to 9s. 9d., the average being 7s. 1d. Within 300 miles to the north of London, the average rate in different districts varied only from 6s. 9d. to 7s. 2d.; but beyond that distance it fell to 5s. 8d. Twenty years later, the same admirable observer, after a detailed examination of the comparative condition of the labouring classes in England and France, pronounced agricultural wages in the latter country to be 76 per cent. lower than in England, and he has left a most emphatic testimony to the enormous superiority in well-being of the English labourer.¹

One change, however, was taking place which was, on the whole, to his disadvantage. It was inevitable that with the progress of agriculture the vast tracts of common land scattered over England should be reclaimed and enclosed, and it was almost equally inevitable that the permanent advantage derived from them should be reaped by the surrounding landlords.

¹ Arthur Young's *Southern Tour*, pp. 321-324. *Northern Tour*, iv. 293-297. *Tour in France*. See, too, Eden's *Hist. of the Poor*, Thornton's *Over-Population and Labour*, Knight's *Pictorial Hist. of England*, vol. iv., Taine's *Ancien Régime*.

Clauses were, it is true, inserted in most Enclosure Bills providing compensation for those who had common rights; and the mere increase of the net produce of the soil had some effect in raising the price of labour; but the main and enduring benefits of the enclosures necessarily remained with those in whose properties the common land was incorporated, and by whose capital it was fructified. After a few generations the right of free pasture, which the English peasant had formerly enjoyed, had passed away, while the compensation he had received was long since dissipated. The great movement for enclosing common land belongs chiefly to the reign of George III., but it had begun on a large scale under his predecessor. Only two Enclosure Acts had been passed under Anne, and only sixteen under George I. Under George II. there were no less than 226, and more than 318,000 acres were enclosed.¹

Though the population of London was only about a sixth part of what it now is, the magnitude of the city relatively to the other towns of the kingdom was not less than at present. Under the Tudors and the Stuarts many attempts had been made to check its growth by proclamations forbidding the erection of new houses, or the entertaining of additional inmates, and peremptorily enjoining the country gentry to return to their homes in order 'to perform the duties of their several charges . . . to be a comfort unto their neighbours . . . to renew and revive hospitality in their respective counties.' Many proclamations of this kind had been issued during the first half of the seventeenth century, but the last occasion on which the royal prerogative was exercised to prevent the extension of London beyond its ancient limits appears to have been in 1674.²

¹ M'Culloch's *Statistical Account of the British Empire*, i. 550.

² Eden's *Hist. of the Poor*, i. 136, 137. Craik's *Hist. of Commerce*, ii. 114. See, too, on the

From that time its progress was unimpeded, and Davenant in 1685 combated the prevalent notion that it was an evil.¹ The cities of London and Westminster, which had originally been far apart, were fully joined in the early years of the seventeenth century, partly, it is said, through the great number of Scotch who came to London on the accession of James I., and settled chiefly along the Strand.² The quarter now occupied by St. James's Square, Pall Mall, St. James's Street, and Arlington Street, was pasture land till about 1680. Evelyn, writing in 1684, stated that London had nearly doubled in his own recollection;³ but in the beginning of the eighteenth century Hackney, Newington, Marylebone, Islington, Chelsea, and Kensington were still rural villages, far removed from the metropolis. Marylebone, which was probably the nearest, was separated from it by a full mile of fields. The growth of London in the first half of the eighteenth century appears to have been chiefly in the direction of Deptford, Hackney, and Bloomsbury. It spread also on the southern bank of the Thames after the building of Westminster Bridge in 1736, and especially in the quarter of the rich, which was extending steadily towards the west. Horace Walpole mentions that when, in the reign of Charles II., Lord Burlington built his great house in Piccadilly, he was asked why he placed it so far out of town, and he answered, because he was determined to have no building beyond him. In little more than half a century Burlington House was so enclosed with new streets that it was in the heart of the west end of London.⁴ In the reign of Queen Anne, the

alarm felt at the increase of London, *Parl. Hist.* iv. 660, 676, 679, 742, 743.

¹ *Essay upon Ways and Means.*

² Howell's *Londinopolis* (1657), p. 346.

³ Evelyn's *Diary*, June 12, 1684.

⁴ *Anecdotes of Painting.*

most fashionable quarters were Bloomsbury Square, Lincoln's Inn Fields, Soho Square, and Queen Square, Westminster. In the reign of George II. they included Leicester Fields, Golden Square, and Charing Cross. Pall Mall, till the middle of the century, was a fashionable promenade. Among other amusements, smock-racing by women was kept up there till 1733.¹

The great nobles whose houses once fringed the Strand generally moved westward. Cavendish, Hanover, and Grosvenor Squares, as well as New Bond Street, the upper part of Piccadilly, the greater part of Oxford Street, and many contiguous streets were built in the first half of the eighteenth century; but Portman Square was not erected till about 1764. On the present site of Curzon Street and of the adjoining streets, May fair, with one short interruption, was annually celebrated till 1756. It lasted for six weeks, and did much to demoralise the neighbourhood, which was also greatly injured by the crowds of ruffians who passed through that quarter to witness the frequent executions at Tyburn. In 1748 we find Chesterfield, whose house stood near the border of May fair, complaining bitterly that the neighbouring district was full of thieves and murderers.² It appears from a map of London, published in 1733,³ that there were no houses to the north of Oxford Street, except the new quarter of Cavendish Square which formed a small promontory bounded by Marylebone Street on the north and by Oxford Street on the south, and extending from Vere Street on the west to near the site which is now occupied by Portland Road. Moving on eastward the northern frontier line of London touched Montague House, now the British Museum. It then gradually ascended, passed a

¹ Andrews' *Eighteenth Century*, p. 62.

² Doran's *Life and Letters of*

Mrs. Montagu, pp. 274, 275.

³ Seymour's *Survey of London*.

few lanes to the north of Clerkenwell Green, and finally reached Hoxton, which was connected by some scattered houses with the metropolis. To the east, London stretched far into Whitechapel Street, Ratcliffe Highway, and Wapping, which, however, were divided from one another by large open spaces. To the west the new quarter of Grosvenor Square extended close to Hyde Park, and there were also a few houses clustered about Hyde Park Corner, but most of the space between Grosvenor Square and what is now called Piccadilly¹ was open ground. Along the Westminster bank of the river the town reached as far as the Horseferry opposite Lambeth. London Bridge was still the only bridge across the Thames, and the only considerable quarter on the southern side of the river was in its neighbourhood. Except a few scattered villages, open fields extended over all the ground which is now occupied by the crowded thoroughfares of Belgravia, Chelsea, and Kensington, and by the many square miles of houses which stretch along the north of London from St. John's Wood to Hackney.

No less than eight parishes were added between the Revolution and the death of George II.,² and many signs indicate the rapid extension of the town. The number of hackney coaches authorised in London, which was only 200 in 1652, was 800 in 1715,³ and the number of sedan chairs was raised from 200 in 1694 to 400 in 1726.⁴ A traveller noticed, about 1724, that while in Paris, Brussels, Rome, and Vienna, coaches could only be hired by the day, or at least by the hour, in London they stood at the corner of every street.⁵ The

¹ The street was then only called Piccadilly to Devonshire House. The continuation was called Portugal Street, and near Hyde Park, the Exeter Road.

² Craik's *Hist. of Commerce*,

ii. 215.

³ Macpherson, ii. 449; iii. 14.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 655; iii. 134.

⁵ Macky's *Journey through England*, i. 168. Muralt's *Letters on the English*, p. 84.

old water supply being found inadequate for the wants of the new western quarter, a company was founded in 1722, and a reservoir formed in Hyde Park.¹ Above all, in 1711 a most important step was taken in the interests of civilisation by the full organisation of a London penny post.² Great progress was made, as we have already seen, in the first half of the eighteenth century in lighting the streets and protecting the passengers, but very little was done to embellish the city. The pavement was scandalously inferior to that of the great towns of the Continent, while the projecting gutters from the roofs of the houses made the streets almost impassable in the rain, and it was not until the first years of George III. that these evils were remedied by law.³ Architectural taste during the ascendancy of Vanbrugh was extremely low, and it is worthy of note that the badness of the bricks employed in building, which has been represented as a peculiar characteristic of the workmanship of the present generation, was already a matter of frequent complaint.⁴

¹ Macpherson, iii. 121.

² Compare Macpherson, ii. 608; iii. 13. The penny post was first instituted in 1682 as a private enterprise by an upholsterer named Murray, who assigned it to one Lockwra, and Government ultimately adopted it. Its first mention in the statute book is in 1711.

³ Pugh's *Life of Hanway*, pp. 127-139. See, too, the description of the state of the streets in Gay's *Trivia*. Macpherson's *Hist. of Commerce*, iii. 360, 477.

⁴ Macaulay has noticed (c. iii.), on the authority of Duke Cosmo, the badness of the bricks of the city which was destroyed by the Fire. Muralt, in the very

beginning of the eighteenth century (p. 76), declares that London houses seldom last more than forty or fifty years, and sometimes drop before the end of that term. The author of the *Letters concerning the Present State of England* (1772) says: 'The material of all common edifices, viz. bricks, are most insufferably bad, to a degree that destroys the beauty of half the buildings about town, making them seem of dirt and mud rather than brick. . . . A law might surely be enacted against using or making such detestable materials, by having all bricks undergo a survey or examination before sale, that are made in London' (p. 241).

The London season extended from October to May, leaving four months during which the theatres were closed and all forms of dissipation suspended.¹ In the middle of the eighteenth century London was still unable to boast of any public gallery of ancient pictures or of any exhibition of the works of modern artists. The British Museum was not yet formed. Zoological Gardens were still unknown, and there was nothing of that variety of collections which is so conspicuous a feature of the present century. At the Tower, it is true, there had for centuries been a collection of wild animals, which many generations of country visitors regarded as so pre-eminent among the sights of London that it has even left its trace upon the language. The lions of the Tower are the origin of that application of the term 'lion' to any conspicuous spectacle or personage, which has long since become universal. A much larger proportion of amusements than at present were carried on in the open air. Besides the popular gatherings of May fair, Bartholomew fair, and Southwark fair, there were the public gardens of Vauxhall and of Ranelagh, which occupy so prominent a place in the pictures of fashionable life by Fielding, Walpole, Goldsmith, Lady W. Montagu, and Miss Burney, and also the less famous entertainments of Marylebone Gardens, and of Cuper's Gardens on the Lambeth side of the Thames. Vauxhall dated from the middle of the seventeenth century, but Ranelagh Gardens, which occupied part of the present site of the gardens of Chelsea Hospital, were only opened in 1742. In the reign of George II. Queen Caroline took great interest in the improvement of the London parks, and it is to her that London is chiefly indebted for the formation of the Serpentine. Kensington Gardens, however, were still reserved for the royal

¹ *Rambler*, No. 124.

family, though they were sometimes thrown open to the upper classes as a special favour or during the absence of the Court. Queen Caroline is said to have once thought of making St. James's Park a royal garden, as it had been before the Restoration, but to have been dissuaded by Sir Robert Walpole, who in answer to her question what such a change would cost, replied, 'Only three crowns.' One of the consequences of the early dinner hours was that after-dinner promenades in the park became a very fashionable pleasure.¹

Coffee-houses, though apparently less conspicuous centres of news, politics, and fashion than they had been under Anne, were still very numerous. At the present day every traveller is struck with the almost complete absence in London of this element of continental life, but in the early years of the eighteenth century coffee-houses were probably more prominent in London than in any other city in Europe. A writer who described the metropolis in 1708, not much more than fifty years after the first coffee-house had been established in England, estimated the number of these institutions at nearly 3,000.²

The fashionable hours were becoming steadily later. Colley Cibber, in describing the popularity of Kynaston, a favourite actor of female parts under Charles II., mentions that ladies of quality were accustomed to take him with them in their coaches to Hyde Park in his theatrical habit after the play, which they could then do, as the play began at four o'clock.³ 'The landmarks of our fathers,' wrote Steele in 1710, 'are removed, and planted further up in the day . . . in my own memory the dinner

¹ See Larwood's *Story of the London Parks*, i. 121, 124, 129, 130; ii. 57.

² Hatton's *New View of London*, i. 30. Many particulars re-

lating to these coffee-houses will be found in Timbs' *Club Life in London*.

³ Cibber's *Apology*, ch. v.

hour has crept by degrees from twelve o'clock to three. Where it will fix nobody knows.'¹ In the reign of George II. the most fashionable dinner hour appears to have been four. The habits of all classes were becoming less simple. Defoe noticed that within the memory of men still living the apprentices of shopkeepers and warehousemen habitually served the families of their masters at table, and discharged other menial functions which in the reign of George I. they would have indignantly spurned.² The merchants who had hitherto lived in the city near their counting-houses, began, early in the eighteenth century, to migrate to other quarters, though they at first seldom went further than Hatton Garden.³ Domestic service was extremely disorganised. Almost all the complaints on this subject, which in our own day we hear upon every side, and which are often cited as conclusive proofs of the degeneracy of the English people, were quite as loud and as emphatic a hundred and fifty years ago as at present. It was said that while no servants in Europe were so highly paid or so well fed as the English, none were so insolent, exacting, or nomadic, that the tie of affection between master and servant was completely broken, that on the smallest provocation or at the hope of the smallest increase of wages, or still more of vails, the servant threw

¹ *Tatler*, No. 263. Fielding writes—

The family that dines the latest
Is in our street esteemed the greatest,
But latest hours must surely fall
'Fore him who never dines at all.

Epistle to Sir R. Walpole.

In the country the old hours seem to have gone on. Pope, in his *Epistle to Mrs. Blount, on her leaving town for the country*, says—

She went to plain work and to purling
brooks,

Old-fashioned halls, dull aunts, and
croaking rooks.

* * * * *

To pass her time twixt reading and
bohea,

To muse, and spill her solitary tea,
Or o'er cold coffee trifle with the spoon,
Count the slow clock, and dine exact at
noon.

² *Behaviour of the Servants of England*, p. 12.

³ See Lawrence's *Life of Fielding*, p. 66.

up his place, and that no other single cause contributed so largely to the discomfort of families. Servants had their clubs, and their societies for maintaining each other when out of place, and they copied only too faithfully the follies and the vices of their masters. There were bitter complaints of how they wore their masters' clothes and assumed their masters' names, how there were in liveries 'beaux, fops, and coxcombs, in as high perfection as among people that kept equipages,' how near the entrance of the law courts and the Parliament a host of servants kept up 'such riotous clamour and licentious confusion' that 'one would think there were no such thing as rule or distinction among us.'¹ In the theatres especially they were a constant source of disturbance. It was the custom of the upper classes to send their footmen before them to keep their places during the first acts of the play, and they afterwards usually retired to the upper gallery, to which they claimed the right of free admission. Their constant disorder led to their expulsion from Drury Lane Theatre in 1737, which they resented by a furious riot. The presence of the Prince and Princess of Wales was unable to allay the storm, and order was not restored till

¹ *Spectator*, No. 88. *World*, No. 157. Angeloni's *Letters on the English*, ii. 38-42. Defoe's *Behaviour of the Servants of England*. Fielding's *Old Men Taught Wisdom*. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1731, pp. 249, 250. Gonzales, a Portuguese traveller who visited England in 1730, writes: 'As to the common and menial servants [of London] they have great wages, are well kept and clothed, but are notwithstanding the plague of almost every house in town. They form themselves into societies,

or rather confederacies, contributing to the maintenance of each other when out of place, and if any of them cannot manage the family where they are entertained as they please, immediately they give notice they will be gone. There is no speaking to them; they are above correction. . . . It is become a common saying, 'If my servant ben't a thief, if he be but honest, I can bear with other things,' and, indeed, it is very rare to meet in London with an honest servant.' —Pinkerton's *Travels*, ii. 95

twenty-five or twenty-six persons had been seriously injured.¹

This state of things was the natural consequence of luxurious and ostentatious habits, acting upon a national character by no means peculiarly adapted to domestic service. There were, however, also several special causes at work, which made the condition of domestic service a great national evil. The most conspicuous were the custom of placing servants on board wages, which was very prevalent in the beginning of the century, and which encouraged them to frequent clubs and taverns; the constant attendance of servants upon their mistresses in the great scenes of fashionable dissipation; the law which communicated to the servants of peers and Members of Parliament the immunity from arrest for debt enjoyed by their masters; and, above all, the system of vails, which made servants in a great degree independent of their masters. This system had been carried in England to an extent unparalleled in Europe; and the great prominence given to it in the literature of the early half of the eighteenth century shows how widespread and demoralising it had become. When dining with his nearest relation a gentleman was expected to pay the servants who attended him, and no one of small fortune could accept many invitations from a great nobleman, on account of the large sums which had to be distributed among the numerous domestics. No feature of English life seemed more revolting or astonishing to foreigners than an English entertainment where the guests, often under the eyes of the host, passed from the drawing-room through a double row of footmen, each one of them expecting and receiving his fee. It was said that a foreign minister, dining on a great occasion with a noble-

¹ Lawrence's *Life of Fielding*, pp. 63, 64. Mrs. Delany's *Life and Correspondence*, i. 398, 399.

man of the highest rank, usually expended in this way as much as ten guineas, that a sum of two or three guineas was a common expenditure in great houses, and that a poor clergyman, invited to dine with his bishop, not unfrequently spent in vails to the servants, at a single dinner, more than would have fed his family for a week. Dr. King tells a story of a poor nobleman who in Queen Anne's time was an intimate friend of the Duke of Ormond, and who regularly received a guinea with every invitation, for distribution among the servants of his host. The effect of this system in weakening the authority of masters, and in demoralising servants, was universally recognised, and soon after the middle of the century a great movement arose to abolish it, the servants being compensated by a higher rate of wages. The movement began among the gentry of Scotland. The grand jury of Northumberland and the grand jury of Wiltshire followed the example, pledging themselves to discourage the system of vails, but many years still elapsed before it was finally eradicated.¹

Of the sanitary condition of the city it is extremely difficult to speak with confidence. There is reason to believe that cleanliness and good ventilation had greatly increased,² and in at least one respect a marked improve-

¹ *Eight Letters to his Grace the Duke of — on the Custom of Vailsgiving in England* [by Hanway, the Persian traveller] (London, 1760). King's *Anecdotes of his Own Time*, pp. 51, 52. Reresby's *Memoirs*, p. 377. Angeloni's *Letters on the English*, ii. 38-42. *World*, No. 60. *Connoisseur*, No. 70. Roberts' *Social Hist. of the Southern Counties*, pp. 32-34.

² 'Many of its streets have been widened, made straight, raised, paved with easy descents

to carry off the water; besides wells in most public yards, and pipes for conveying plenty of fresh water to keep them clean and sweet; many late stately edifices, large clean courts, lofty rooms, large sashlights, &c., and many excellent conveniences both by land and water, for supplying the city with fresh provisions at moderate prices . . . must contribute not a little to make the city more healthy.' — Short's *Comparative Hist. of the Increase and Decrease of Mankind*

ment of the national health had recently taken place. The Plague of London was not a single or isolated outburst. It had been chronic in London during the whole of the seventeenth century, and though greatly diminished had not been extirpated by the Fire. By the beginning of the eighteenth century it completely disappeared, and it was noticed that from this time the deaths from colic and dysentery decreased with an extraordinary rapidity. In each successive decennial period in the first half of the eighteenth century the annual average of deaths from this source was much less than in the preceding one, and the average in the last decennial period is said to have been little more than a tenth of what it had been in the first one.¹ The statistics, however, both of disease and of population, were so fluctuating and so uncertain that it is rash to base much upon them. It appears, however, evident that the mortality of the towns as compared with the country, and the mortality of infants as compared with adults, were considerably greater than at present,² and also that the population of London in the second quarter of the century, if it did not, as was often said, absolutely decrease, at least advanced much less rapidly than in the first quarter. The great spread of gin-drinking was followed

in *England and Abroad* (1767), p. 20. See, too, Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 321.

¹ Heberden's *Observations on the Increase and Decrease of different Diseases* (1801). This eminent authority, having given many statistics on the subject, concludes: 'The cause of so great an alteration in the health of the people of England (for it is not confined to the metropolis) I have no hesitation in attributing to the improvements which have gradually taken place, not

only in London but in all the great towns, and in the manner of living throughout the kingdom; particularly in respect to cleanliness and ventilation' (p. 35).

² See the article on Vital Statistics in M'Culloch's *Statistical Account of the British Empire*, and Short's *Comparative History*. According to Short, 'the cities and great towns in the kingdom may be deemed as so many slaughterhouses of the people of the nation' (p. 22).

both by a serious diminution in the number of births, and by a great increase in the number of deaths, and was, no doubt, regarded, with justice, as the chief enemy of the public health.¹ Medical science had been somewhat improved, but the practice of lowering the constitution by excessive bleedings was so general that it may be questioned whether on the whole it did not kill more than it cured. The great progress of botany had, as was natural, some effect upon it. A garden of medical plants was created at Chelsea by the Company of Apothecaries as early as 1673, and it was greatly improved in the early years of the eighteenth century, chiefly by the instrumentality of Sir Hans Sloane. This very remarkable man was almost equally distinguished as a physician and as a botanist, and among other services to medicine he greatly extended the use of Peruvian bark.² A still more important fact in the history of English medicine was the increased study of anatomy. The popular prejudice against dissection which had for centuries paralysed and almost prevented this study still ran so high in England that in spite of the number of capital punishments, it was only with great difficulty the civil power could accommodate surgeons with proper subjects, and all publicity was studiously avoided. No

¹ Dr. Short says the passion for spirituous liquors 'began to diffuse its pernicious effects in 1724, at the very time when the city began to be more fruitful and healthy than it had been since the Restoration. How powerfully this poison wrought let us now see. From 1704 to 1724 were born 336,514, buried 474,125. Let us allow fourteen years for this dire bane to spread, operate, and become epidemic; then from 1738 to 1758 were born 296,831, buried 486,171. Here

we have two shocking effects of this bewitching liquor. First, here is a greater barrenness, a decrease or want of 40,000 of ordinary births which the last vicennary produced, instead of an increase, as we had in other vicennaries. Secondly, an increase of 12,000 burials, though there was so great a defect of births.' —Short's *Comparative History*, p. 21.

² Pulteney, *Progress of Botany in England*, ii. 85, 99–103.

English artist, unless he desired to hold up to abhorrence the persons whose portraits he drew, would have painted such a subject as the famous study of anatomy by Rembrandt. With such a state of feeling it is not surprising that the English medical school, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, should have been far inferior to that which gathered round the chair of Boerhaave at Leyden. In the reign of Queen Anne, however, a French refugee surgeon, named Bussière, began for the first time to give public lectures on anatomy in England, and the example was speedily followed by two anatomists of great ability.¹ Cheselden commenced, in 1711, a series of lectures on anatomy, which continued for twenty years. The first Monro opened a similar course at Edinburgh in 1719, and a school of medicine arose in that city which in the latter part of the century had no superior in Europe. The passion for anatomy was shown in the illegal efforts made to obtain bodies for dissection; and Shenstone, in one of his elegies, complains bitterly of the frequent violation of the tomb.²

In the first half of the eighteenth century also the first serious attempt was made to restrain the small-pox, which had long been one of the greatest scourges of Europe. Inoculation, as is well known, was introduced into England from Turkey by Lady Mary Montagu, and by Dr. Maitland, the physician of the Embassy, and the son of the former, afterwards the famous traveller, was the first English subject who was inoculated. On her return to England in 1722, Lady Mary Montagu laboured earnestly to propagate the system, and the Princess of Wales, afterwards Queen Caroline, whose mind was always open to new ideas, and who exhibited

¹ Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, iv. 618. Miller's *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 10. Charles II. had given the Royal

Society the privilege of taking bodies of malefactors for anatomical purposes. Hatton's *New View of London*, ii. 665.

² Elegy xxii.

no small courage in carrying them out, at once perceived the importance of the discovery. She obtained permission to have the experiment tried on five criminals who had been condemned to death, and who were pardoned on the condition of undergoing it. In four cases it was perfectly successful, and the remaining criminal confessed that she had had the disease when a child.

The physicians, however, at first generally discouraged the practice. Popular feeling was vehemently roused against it, and some theologians denounced it as tempting Providence by artificially superinducing disease, endeavouring to counteract a Divine visitation, and imitating the action of the devil, who caused boils to break out upon the body of Job. Sir Hans Sloane, however, fully recognised the value of inoculation, and the Princess of Wales had two of her children inoculated in the very beginning of the movement. This act exposed her to no little obloquy, but it had some effect in encouraging the practice, and the adhesion of Madox, the Bishop of Worcester, was useful in counteracting the theological prejudice it had aroused. Still, for some years it advanced very slowly. Only 845 persons were inoculated in England in the eight years that followed its introduction, and it seemed likely altogether to die out, when news arrived that some of the planters in the West Indies had made use of it for their slaves with complete success. From this time the tide turned. In 1746 a small-pox hospital was founded in London for the purpose of inoculation, and in 1754 the College of Physicians pronounced in its favour. It had, however, long to struggle against violent prejudice. As late as 1765 only 6,000 persons had been inoculated in Scotland. In 1768 a hospital for inoculation at Peterborough was burnt by the mob, and in the following year the practice was forbidden by law in the colony of Virginia.

This prejudice was less unreasonable than has been supposed. Though some patients died from inoculation, its efficacy in securing those who underwent the operation from one of the most deadly of diseases was unquestionable. It was, however, only very partially practised, and as its object was to produce in the patient the disease in a mitigated form, it had the effect of greatly multiplying centres of infection, and thus propagating the very evil it was intended to arrest. To those who were wise enough to avail themselves of it, it was a great blessing; but to the poor and the ignorant, who repudiated it, it was a scourge, and for some years after it was widely introduced, the deaths from small-pox were found rapidly to increase. If inoculation can be regarded as a national benefit, it was chiefly because it led the way to the great discovery of Jenner.¹

It was in this respect somewhat characteristic of the period in which it arose. One of the most remarkable features of the first sixty years of the eighteenth century is the great number of new powers or influences that were then called into action of which the full significance was only perceived long afterwards. It was in this period that Russia began to intervene actively in Western politics, and Prussia to emerge from the crowd of obscure German States into a position of commanding eminence. It was in this period that the first steps were taken in many works which were destined in succeeding generations to exercise the widest and most abiding influence on human affairs. It was then that

¹ Lady M. W. Montagu's *Works* (Lord Wharncliffe's ed.), i. xxii, 55-60, 391-393. Baron's *Life of Jenner*, i. 230-233. *Gentleman's Magazine*, xxvii. 409. Haygarth on *Casual Small-pox* (1793), i. 31. Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes of the Eigh-*

teenth Century, iv. 625. Nichols' *Literary Illustrations*, i. 277-280. Voltaire's *Lettres sur les Anglois*, let. xi. Heberden's *Observations on the Increase and Decrease of Disease*, p. 36. Walpole's *Memoirs of George III.* iii. 198. Stanhope's *Hist. of England*, v. 8.

the English Deists promulgated doctrines which led the way to the great movement of European scepticism; that Diderot founded the French Encyclopædia; that Voltaire began his crusade against the dominant religion of Christendom; that a few obscure Quakers began the long struggle for the abolition of slavery; that Wesley sowed the first seeds of religious revival in England. Without any great or salient revolutions the aspect of Europe was slowly changing, and before the middle of the century had arrived both the balance of power and the lines of division and antagonism were profoundly modified. Industrial interests and the commercial spirit had acquired a new preponderance in politics, and theological influence had at least proportionately declined. The fear of Mohammedan aggression, which was one great source of theological passions in Christendom, had now passed away. The power of the Turks was broken by the war which ended in the Peace of Carlowitz, and eighteen years later by the victories of Eugene, and although they waged a successful war with Austria in 1739, their triumph was much more due to the disorganisation of their opponents than to their own strength. Among Christian sects the frontier lines were now clearly traced. In Germany, as we have seen, the political position of Protestantism at the time of the Revolution appeared very precarious, and a new danger arose when the Sovereign of Saxony bartered his faith for the crown of Poland. But this danger had wholly passed. The elevation of Hanover into an Electorate and of Prussia into a kingdom, the additional strength acquired by Hanover through its connection with England, and the rapid development of the greatness of Prussia, would have secured German Protestantism from danger even if the zeal of the Catholic States had not greatly abated. The only religious war of the period broke out in Switzerland in 1712; it ended in the com-

plete triumph of the Protestant cantons, and the spirit of fanaticism and of persecution had everywhere declined. Two Protestant States, however, which had played a great and noble part in the history of the seventeenth century, had sunk gradually into comparative insignificance. Sweden never recovered the effects of its disastrous war with Russia. Holland, through causes that were partly political and partly economical, had ceased to exercise any great influence beyond its borders. France exhibited some decline of energy and ambition, and a marked decline of administrative and military ability; and some of the elements of decomposition might be already detected which led to the convulsions of the Revolution. In England the Protestant succession and parliamentary institutions were firmly established, and the position of the country in Europe was on the whole sustained.

CHAPTER VI.

THE COLONIES AND SCOTLAND.

AMONG the British dependencies in the middle of the eighteenth century, the first place must be given to the colonies in North America. It was a signal proof of the wisdom of the English legislators of the seventeenth century, that they conceded to these colonies charters which secured them an almost absolute self-government; while the number of the American provinces, and the diversity of the religions of the colonists, led to a much larger measure of religious liberty than existed in Europe. To these two inestimable advantages must be added a country of almost unlimited resources, and a people who, in energy, moral excellence, and practical wisdom, were probably unsurpassed upon the earth. In the present century the immigration of a large foreign population is seldom favourable to the moral condition of a nation. Emigration has become so easy and so familiar, that it is the resource of multitudes but little removed from simple pauperism. Men of ordinary characters usually deteriorate when severed from the ties of home traditions, associations, and opinions; and they seldom feel any strong attachment for a country which was not that of their childhood. But in the seventeenth century the conditions of emigration were essentially different. The difficulties of the enterprise were such that those who encountered them were almost always men of much more than common strength of character, and they were to a very large extent men

whose motive in abandoning their country was the intensity of their religious or political convictions. It is the peculiarity of the British colonies in America that they were mainly founded and governed by such men. Puritans in New England, Episcopalians in Virginia, Quakers in Pennsylvania, Catholics in Maryland—each province contained numbers who, during the persecutions of the Stuarts or of the Commonwealth, had sought in the Western world the opportunity of freely professing their faith. From the time of the Pilgrim Fathers to the time when the Salzburg Protestants flocked to the new colony of Georgia in 1732, America was pre-eminently the home of the refugees; and this fact is, perhaps, the most important in its history. After all that can be said of material and intellectual advantages, it remains true that moral causes lie at the root of the greatness of nations; and it is probable that no nation ever started on its career with a larger proportion of strong characters, or a higher level of moral conviction, than the English colonies in America.

Many other circumstances combined to mark them out as the predestined seat of a great free nation. Founded in nearly every case without any pecuniary assistance from the mother country, and separated from it by 3,000 miles of water, they were, during the earlier stages of their existence, practically almost beyond the knowledge and control of the Government at home; and most of the colonists belonged to those non-episcopal Churches which, by throwing on the people the duties of ecclesiastical government, have been the best schools of political freedom. Without bishops, without peers, without a resident sovereign, without superfluous offices or endowments, with a population consisting almost wholly of freeholders scattered thinly over an immense territory and mainly occupied in agricultural pursuits, their politics were naturally of the

simplest and freest kind; and they almost entirely escaped the corruption that so deeply tainted the Government at home. Their progress, though less rapid than it afterwards became, was eminently healthy and steady. In less than eighty years after the first permanent English settlement there were twelve distinct colonial governments; and the population, which at the time of the Revolution was estimated at about 200,000, had risen to 1,000,000 some years before the middle of the century.¹

There were, no doubt, many shadows on the picture. From the nature of their population the American colonies contained a very large amount of the fiercest religious fanaticism; and although in some provinces noble efforts were made to establish freedom of worship, these efforts were altogether exceptional. What religious liberty existed was much more the consequence of the extent of territory, and of the multiplication of provinces, which enabled each sect to find a home, than of the dispositions of the people themselves.² The history of Salem witchcraft, of the persecution of the Quakers in Massachusetts, and of the suppression of religious liberty in Maryland, as well as a crowd of savage or absurd laws regulating, in the interests of religion, not only the opinions but also the minutest actions of the people, remain to show how far the colonists were from attaining any high general standard of religious freedom. Nor were their faults exclusively those of saints. Their warfare and intercourse with Indians were often marked by gross cruelty or injustice. The practice of kidnapping men at the English, Scotch, or Irish ports, to sell them to American planters, con-

¹ Hildreth's *Hist. of the United States* (ed. 1849), ii. 127, 373.

² See two remarkable chapters on religious intolerance in the

colonies in Burke's *Account of the European Settlements in America*.

tinued far into the eighteenth century; a numerous race of daring pirates found secure homes along the deserted seaboard of America; and the colonial population, if it contained much of the highest excellence, contained also not a little of the refuse, of Europe. As numbers increased and as the condition of society became more complex, violent disputes arose in many provinces between the colonists and the proprietary, and they generally ended in an increase of the power of the Crown. The proprietary governments sometimes degenerated into narrow oligarchies; the theocratical laws of New England excited wide and general irritation, and in the last days of the Stuarts there were many conflicts between the Home Government and the colonies. Under Charles II. the charter of Massachusetts was annulled on the pretext of violation of the Navigation Act; under James II. the illegal Declaration of Indulgence was published in the colonies, and the constitutions of Rhode Island, of Connecticut, and of Plymouth were invaded.

They were re-established at the Revolution, but that great event was on the whole not favourable to America. While it greatly lowered the royal authority at home, it rather increased it beyond the Atlantic; for the commercial classes who rose to power viewed with extreme jealousy the growing independence of the colonies, and were especially anxious to secure for themselves the most rigid monopoly of trade. William more than once exercised his power of veto against declaratory Acts of the Colonial Assemblies tending towards independence, and there was a great desire on the part of the Government to bring all the colonies under the direct management of the Crown. The disputes in some colonies between the colonists and the proprietaries, the embarrassment resulting in time of war from distinct forms of government, the Jacobitism of

Penn, who had founded one great colony, and the Catholicism of Lord Baltimore, who had established another, assisted in the transformation. The charter of Massachusetts was not restored, but a new charter was granted much more favourable to the Crown. Bills were brought in, in 1701 and in 1721, for the resumption of all the colonial charters; and although these bills were not carried, several charters were surrendered in the thirty years that followed the Revolution, and a new system was established more favourable to the supremacy of the Crown.¹ It is not necessary here to follow in detail these changes, which have now lost most of their interest, and it is sufficient to indicate their general scope. In the old proprietary and charter colonies the forms of government were very various, but the great principle was the division of power, in widely different proportions, between the proprietary and the freeholders; and the colonial legislatures, though restricted in their sphere, were in that sphere almost supreme. In the proprietary colonies, which consisted, at the time of the Revolution, of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Carolina, and Delaware, certain individuals called proprietaries appointed the governors and authorised them to summon legislative assemblies. In the other charter colonies, which then consisted of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, nearly all power resided with the freemen. In the Crown colonies, on the other hand, the government was a faint copy of the English Constitution. Every Bill, in order to become law, had to be read three times by the Council and Assembly, and assented to by the Governor. The Governor and the Council, as well as the judges, were appointed by the Crown, but the Assembly was a representative body elected by the colonists. The members

¹ See Bancroft, iii. 68-70, 107, 108. Hildreth, ii. 123, 124.

of the Council were nominated from among the chief persons in the colony. They discharged the functions not only of a House of Lords, but also of a Privy Council to the Governor, and in some cases of a Court of Chancery, but they only held office during pleasure. The Crown did not consider itself bound by the colonial Acts, and reserved to itself a power of subsequent veto in the case of measures which had received the assent of the Governor; and civil cases of the more important kind might be carried on appeal to England. In 1696 a law was passed modifying the condition of the charter colonies, enjoining that no proprietors should dispose of their land, without licence from the Sovereign, to any but British subjects, conferring on the Crown a negative upon the Governors, who were nominated by the proprietors, and asserting the nullity of any colonial Act or usage that was repugnant to English Acts relating to the colonies.¹ To maintain the complete ascendancy of the British Parliament over all colonial authorities became a fundamental maxim, and each change in government was intended to strengthen the influence of the Crown. During the peaceful administration of Walpole, however, the moderation of the Government extended to the colonies, and the happy neglect of Newcastle, to whose department they belonged, was probably on the whole very conducive to their prosperity.²

¹ Bancroft, iii. 105. Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, ii. 683, 684.

² Walpole gives a curious description of 'the extreme ignorance in which the English Court had kept themselves of the affairs of America.' 'The Board of Trade during Sir R. Walpole's administration had very faultily been suffered to lapse almost into

a sinecure, and during all that period the Duke of Newcastle had been Secretary of State. It would not be credited what reams of paper, representations, memorials, petitions from that quarter of the world lay mouldering and unopened in his office. . . . He knew as little of the geography of his province as of the state of it. When General Ligonier

They had long eclipsed all rivals in North America. The great extent of Spanish territory which spread to the south of the British colonies was afflicted with that political atrophy which had passed over the other parts of the once mighty empire to which it belonged; and the Dutch, who in so many quarters rivalled or surpassed the colonial enterprise of England, had been long driven from North America. New Netherlands, captured by the English in 1664, was confirmed as a British possession by the Peace of 1667, the Dutch retaining, as a compensation, the colony of Surinam, in Guiana, which they had taken from the English. New Amsterdam, the capital of the Dutch settlement in North America, consisted chiefly of small thatched houses, and was so poor and so mean that the English general complained that he was unable to find in the town bedding for his soldiers. In compliment to the brother of the King, it was called by its conquerors New York—a name destined to occupy a great space in the eyes of the world. The French settlements were more important, but they were dwarfed and stunted by a restrictive and centralised, though not unskilful, system of government;¹ and when the Revolution involved the two nations in war, the superior force of the English colonies was so manifest that William refused the offer of colonial neutrality which had been made by Lewis. The French settlers at the time of the Revolution were officially reckoned at not more than 11,249 persons,

hinted some defence to him for Annapolis, he replied, with his evasive lisping hurry: "Annapolis, Annapolis? Oh, yes! Annapolis must be defended, to be sure Annapolis should be defended—Where is Annapolis?"' *Memoirs of George II.* i. 396.

¹ In that able work on *The*

European Settlements in America (published anonymously in 1757), which was written at least in part by Burke, a much more favourable judgment is passed on the French colonial governments than is usual in modern American and English histories.

about a twentieth part of the population of the English colonies.¹ They were scattered over Canada, Acadia, Newfoundland, and the borders of Hudson's Bay ; they laid claim to large tracts of almost uninhabited territory, which were under British rule ; and though each nation possessed, beyond dispute, tracts immeasurably greater than it could occupy, a keen competition existed between them. A long series of wars, rendered very horrible by the employment on both sides of Indian auxiliaries, ensued. The Peace of Ryswick did not alter the relative positions of the two nations, as it provided that each should possess the territories it occupied before the war, and that commissioners should be appointed to settle the disputed frontier. The Peace of Utrecht advanced greatly the English power, for Newfoundland, Acadia, now called Nova Scotia, and the borders of Hudson's Bay, passed into their possession, but the frontier line continued ill-defined, and a subject of perpetual dispute. The French endeavoured with great energy to repair their disasters. They occupied Cape Breton, which commanded the St. Lawrence, and erected there the powerful fortifications of Louisburg. They strengthened their new colony of Louisiana, founded New Orleans in 1718, and encroached steadily on what was claimed as English territory along the Ohio and the Alleghany. The establishment of Georgia brought the English colonists into closer connection with the Spaniards ; and during the war of the Austrian succession Oglethorpe carried on hostilities with skill and daring along the disputed frontiers of Georgia and Florida. In the north the English colonists obtained a brilliant triumph by the capture of Louisburg and consequent subjugation of Cape Breton ; and, by a singular stroke of good fortune, a great French expedition against

¹ Bancroft, iii. 177.

Nova Scotia in 1746 was dispersed and shattered by two furious storms. The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle left the American frontiers almost unchanged, for Cape Breton was restored to the French in compensation for Madras, but the foundation of Halifax contributed much to strengthen the great ascendancy of England; and the whole white population of French America, about the middle of this century, was said not to have been more than 52,000, while that of British America was reckoned at 1,051,000.

The real evil of the colonial government lay in the commercial policy of the mother country—in the system of restrictions intended to secure for England a monopoly of the colonial trade, and to crush every manufacture that could compete with English industry. It was a policy which sprang, in a great degree, from that mercantile theory which denied the possibility of a commerce mutually beneficial to the parties engaged in it. It was strengthened by the Revolution, which gave commercial interests and the commercial classes a new pre-eminence in English legislation, and it had political consequences of the gravest character. In a very few instances, it is true, it was considered an English interest to encourage colonial produce. Thus Virginia, though afterwards forbidden to export her tobacco to any foreign country, had obtained under the first two Stuarts, in conjunction with Bermuda, a monopoly of the English market, and the cultivation of tobacco at home was absolutely forbidden.¹ For a long time the tar and pitch of the British navy had come chiefly from Sweden; but that Power having conferred the monopoly of the trade upon a mercantile company, the price was inordinately raised. Under these circumstances the Ministers resolved to

¹ Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, ii. 329, 332, 486.

secure the materials for the navy from the British colonies, and Acts were accordingly passed, in 1703 and 1711, encouraging by bounties the import from the American colonies of tar, pitch, hemp, masts, and yards, and at the same time reserving all pine-trees of certain specified dimensions, that were not private property, for his Majesty's navy.¹

But with these exceptions, the laws were almost wholly restrictive. The famous Navigation Acts, intended to exclude foreigners from the trade, provided that all vessels trading to or from the plantations should be built in England or the plantations, and limited both the export and import trade, as far as the most important articles were concerned, to the British dominions.² Another measure declared in its preamble that the woollen manufacture, which had begun to rise among the colonists, 'would inevitably sink the value of lands' in England; and it proceeded utterly to destroy the intercolonial trade by enacting that, 'after the 1st of December, 1699, no wool or manufacture made or mixed with wool, being the produce of any of the English plantations in America, shall be loaden in any ship or vessel, upon any pretence whatever, nor loaden upon any horse, cart, or other carriage, to be carried out of the English plantations to any other of the said plantations, or to any other place whatever.'³ In 1719 the House of Commons resolved 'that the erecting of manufactories in the colonies tended to lessen their dependence upon Great Britain.' In 1721 George I., when opening Parliament, recommended the policy of deriving the naval stores from the North American colonies,

¹ 3 & 4 Anne, c. x.; 9 Anne, c. xvii.

² 12 Charles II. c. xviii.; 15 Charles II. c. vii.; 22 & 23 Charles II. c. xxvi.; 25 Charles

II. c. vii.; 7 & 8 William III. c. xxii.

³ 10 & 11 William III. c. x. (abridged).

on the express ground that ‘the cultivation of this useful and advantageous branch of commerce would divert the colonies from setting up manufactures which directly interfered with those of Great Britain.’ Iron existed largely in the colonies; and in a new country covered with unfelled timber, and depending mainly on ship-building, the trade of the smith was of pre-eminent importance. But the English House of Commons, in the interests of the English manufacturer, passed a measure in 1719 that none of the American colonies should manufacture iron of any kind; that no smith might make so much as a bolt, a spike, or a nail; and the House of Lords added a clause to the effect that no forge should be erected in any of the colonies for making ‘sows, pigs, or cast iron into bar or rod iron.’¹ Such a measure would have hopelessly ruined the colonies, and it raised so vehement an opposition that it was dropped; but the export of American iron to the mother country was restrained by heavy duties till 1750. The introduction of pig and bar iron was then freely admitted; but in order that the American manufacture should never rise above the most rudimentary stage, it was provided that no mill or other engine for rolling iron, or furnace for making steel, should be permitted in the colonies.² No part of the world possessed furs in greater abundance, or of finer quality, than North America; and it was therefore obviously absurd that all hats should be imported from the mother country; but no sooner had the colonists begun to make their own hats than the English hatters took the alarm, and Parliament in 1732 made a law forbidding the exportation of American hats, not only to foreign countries and to the mother country, but even from one colony to another, and at the same time providing that no colonist should pursue the trade unless he had served

¹ Macpherson’s *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 72, 73. ² Ibid. iii. 280.

a seven years' apprenticeship, should have more than two apprentices at a time, or should teach the industry to negroes.¹ The measure was successful, and an industry in which the colonies were naturally peculiarly fitted to excel speedily languished. The colonists were accustomed to send large quantities of provisions and lumber to the French West Indian colonies, and to bring back in return rum, sugar, and molasses. The English sugar colonies complained, and a law was passed in 1733 imposing heavy penalties on all rum, sugar, and molasses imported into America except from the British colonies.² It was, indeed, found impossible to enforce this law, but it long remained unrepealed upon the statute book.

In this manner England made it a fixed maxim of her commercial policy to crush every rising industry in her colonies that could possibly compete with the home market. On the other hand, it must be admitted that she had hitherto abstained from deriving from them a direct revenue, and it must be added that some system of commercial restraint was universally pursued, and that the English system was not sufficiently severe to counteract the great material and political advantages of her colonies. Farming and shipbuilding, the trade in furs, provisions, tar, and pitch, the magnificent cod fisheries of Newfoundland, and the whale fishery, which had received a new impulse through the invention of a gun by which the harpoon could be plunged from a great distance into the body of the fish, were the chief sources of colonial wealth; and there was also a considerable linen manufacture created by Irish emigrants, and a large smuggling trade which it was happily impossible to suppress. The country was growing rapidly richer, though its progress was seriously retarded, and though

¹ 5 George II. c. xxii.

² 6 George II. c. xiii.

many of its natural capacities were paralysed by law. But the political alienation which was the inevitable and most righteous consequence of these laws had already begun, and it is to the antagonism of interests they created, much more than to the Stamp Act or to any isolated instances of misgovernment, that the subsequent disruption must be ascribed.¹ To a sagacious observer of colonial politics two facts were becoming evident. The one was that the deliberate selfishness of English commercial legislation was digging a chasm between the mother country and the colonies which must inevitably, when the latter had become sufficiently strong, lead to separation. The other was that the presence of the French in Canada was an essential condition of the maintenance of the British Empire in America. It was a perpetual danger to the colonists, and as long as the French Canadians were assisted by France it was impossible for the British colonists to dispense with the assistance of England. By ordinary statesmen these things appear to have been altogether unperceived, but even at the time we are considering there were those who foretold them. In 1748 the Swedish traveller Kalm, having described in vivid colours the commercial oppression under which the colonists were suffering, and the growing coldness of their feelings towards the mother country, added these remarkable words: 'I have been told, not only by native Americans, but by English emigrants publicly, that within thirty or fifty years the English colonies

¹ As Arthur Young very justly said, 'Nothing can be more idle than to say that this set of men, or the other administration, or that great minister occasioned the American war. It was not the Stamp Act nor the repeal of the Stamp Act, it was neither

Lord Rockingham nor Lord North, but it was that baleful spirit of commerce that wished to govern great nations on the maxims of the counter.'—Preface to the *Tour in Ireland*. See, too, Huskisson's *Speech on the Navigation Laws*.

in North America may constitute a separate State entirely independent of England. But as this whole country towards the sea is unguarded, and on the frontier is kept uneasy by the French, these dangerous neighbours are the reason why the love of these colonies for their metropolis does not utterly decline. The English Government has, therefore, reason to regard the French in North America as the chief power which urges their colonies to submission.'¹

The commercial disabilities were not the only grievances under which the colonies laboured. Another—which, however, never attained any very serious proportions—was the influx of English criminals. The system of selling English criminals to the colonists for a limited period of servitude may, indeed, be traced back to a much earlier period, but it was revived or increased by a statute of George I.,² and it introduced a very pernicious element into colonial life.³ Another, and a much more terrible evil, was the rapid multiplication of negro slaves. Of all the many forms of suffering which man has inflicted upon man, with the exception of war, and, perhaps, of religious persecution, the slave trade has probably added most largely to the sum of human misery, and in the first half of the eighteenth century it occupied the very foremost place in English commerce. The first Englishman who took part in it appears to have been John Hawkins, who sailed in 1562 with three ships to Sierra Leone, where he secured, 'partly by the sworde and partly by other meanes,' some 300 negroes, whom he transported to Hispaniola. The enterprise proving successful, he made a much more considerable expedition in 1564 to the coast of

¹ Quoted by Bancroft, iii. 464,
465

² 4 George I. c. xi.

³ See Colquhoun on the *Police*

of the Metropolis (7th ed. 1806),
pp. 436, 437. Harris's *Life of*
Lord Hardwicke, i. 156.

Guinea, the English 'going every day on shore to take the inhabitants with burning and spoiling their towns,' and the achievement was so highly considered at home that he was knighted by Elizabeth, and selected for his crest a manacled negro. It is a slight fact, but full of a ghastly significance as illustrating the state of feeling prevailing at the time, that the ship in which Hawkins sailed on his second expedition to open the English slave trade was called 'The Jesus.'¹ The traffic in human flesh speedily became popular. A monopoly of it was granted to the African Company, but it was invaded by numerous interlopers, and in 1698 the trade was thrown open to all British subjects. It is worthy of notice that while by the law of 1698 a certain percentage was exacted from other African cargoes for the maintenance of the forts along that coast, cargoes of negroes were especially exempted, for the Parliament of the Revolution desired especially to encourage the trade.² Nine years before, a convention had been made between England and Spain for supplying the Spanish West Indies with slaves from the island of Jamaica,³ and it has been computed that between 1680 and 1700 the English tore from Africa about 300,000 negroes, or about 15,000 every year.⁴

The great period of the English slave trade had, however, not yet arrived. It was only in 1713 that it began to attain its full dimensions. One of the most important and most popular parts of the Treaty of Utrecht was the contract known as the *Assiento*, by which the British Government secured for its subjects during thirty years an absolute monopoly of the supply of slaves to the Spanish colonies. The traffic was regulated by a long and elaborate treaty, guarding among

¹ Hakluyt's *Voyages*, vol. iii.

³ Macpherson, ii. 638.

² Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, ii. 702.

⁴ Bancroft's *Hist. of the United States*, iii. 411.

other things against any possible scandal to the Roman Catholic religion from the presence of heretical slave-traders, and it provided that in the thirty years from 1713 to 1743 the English should bring into the Spanish West Indies no less than 144,000 negroes, or 4,800 every year, that during the first twenty-five years of the contract they might import a still greater number on paying certain moderate duties, and that they might carry the slave trade into numerous Spanish ports from which it had hitherto been excluded. The monopoly of the trade was granted to the South Sea Company, and from this time its maintenance, and its extension both to the Spanish dominions and to her own colonies, became a central object of English policy. A few facts will show the scale on which it was pursued. From Christmas 1752 to Christmas 1762 no less than 71,115 negroes were imported into Jamaica.¹ In a despatch written at the end of 1762, Admiral Rodney reports that in little more than three years 40,000 negroes had been introduced into Guadeloupe.² In a discussion upon the methods of making the trade more effectual, which took place in the English Parliament in 1750, it was shown that 46,000 negroes were at this time annually sold to the English colonies alone.³ A letter of General O'Hara, the Governor of Senegambia, written in 1766, estimates at the almost incredible figure of 70,000 the number of negroes who during the preceding fifty years had been annually shipped from Africa.⁴ A distinguished modern historian, after a careful comparison of the materials we possess, declares that in the century preceding the prohibition of the slave trade by the American Congress, in 1776, the number of negroes imported by the English alone into the Spanish, French,

¹ Macpherson, iii. 403.

² Grenville Correspondence, ii.

12.

³ Walpole's *Letters*, Feb. 25, 1750.

⁴ Macpherson, iii. 438.

and English colonies can, on the lowest computation, have been little less than three millions, and that we must add more than a quarter of a million who perished on the voyage, and whose bodies were thrown into the Atlantic.¹

These figures are in themselves sufficiently eloquent. No human imagination, indeed, can conceive, no pen can adequately portray, the misery they represent. Torn from the most distant parts of Africa, speaking no common language, connected by no tie except that of common misfortune, severed from every old association and from all they loved, and exchanging, in many cases, a life of unbounded freedom for a hopeless, abject, and crushing servitude, the wretched captives were carried across the waste of waters in ships so crowded and so unhealthy that, even under favourable circumstances, about twelve in every hundred usually died from the horrors of the passage. They had no knowledge, no rights, no protection against the caprices of irresponsible power. The immense disproportion of the sexes consigned them to the most brutal vice. Difference of colour and difference of religion led their masters to look upon them simply as beasts of burden, and the supply of slaves was too abundant to allow the motive of self-interest to be any considerable security for their good treatment. Often, indeed, it seemed the interest of the master rather to work them rapidly to death and then to replenish his stock. All Africa was convulsed by civil wars and infested with bands of native slave-dealers hunting down victims for the English trader, whose blasting influence, like some malignant providence, extended over mighty regions where the face of a white man was never seen.

It has been frequently stated that England is re-

¹ Bancroft's *Hist. of the United States*, iii. 411, 412.

sponsible for the introduction of negro slavery into British America; but this assertion will not stand the test of examination. The first cargo of negro slaves introduced into North America is said to have been conveyed by a Dutch vessel to Virginia in 1620.¹ Slavery existed in New York and New Jersey when they were still Dutch; in Carolina, Maryland, and Pennsylvania when they were still subject to proprietary governments. Its encouragement only became an object of the colonial policy of England at the time of the Peace of Utrecht, but before that date it had been planted in every British colony in North America, had become eminently popular among the colonists, and had been sanctioned by many enactments issuing from colonial legislatures. It is, however, true that from a very early period a certain movement against it may be detected in some American States, that there was, especially in the Northern Provinces, a great and general dislike to the excessive importation of negroes, and that every attempt to prohibit or restrict that importation was rebuked and defeated by England.² As early as 1701 we find a petition in favour of the emancipation of negroes presented to the representatives of Boston. In 1703 a duty of 4*l.* was imposed on every slave introduced into Massachusetts. After the Peace of Utrecht many States, and among others South Carolina itself, remonstrated and struggled against the vast importation of slaves. They had, however, no power to prohibit it by law. Several English Acts of Parliament were passed to encourage the slave trade,³ the State Governors were forbidden to give the

¹ Hildreth, *Hist. of the United States*, i. 119, 120.

² See, on this subject, Graham's *Review of the American Apology for American Accession to Negro Slavery*. The question of negro slavery is treated with

much ability and impartiality in Hildreth's *Hist. of the United States*. Mr. Bancroft writes in a vehement anti-English spirit.

³ The following, e.g., is the preamble of one of the laws passed in the ministry of the

necessary assent to any measures restricting it, and the English pursued this policy steadily to the very eve of the Revolution. As late as 1775 we find Lord Dartmouth, the Secretary of State for the Colonies and one of the most conspicuous leaders of the English religious world, answering the remonstrance of a colonial agent in these memorable words: 'We cannot allow the colonies to check or discourage in any degree a traffic so beneficial to the nation.'¹

It has been computed that up to the year 1740 the number of negroes who had been introduced into the North American colonies was nearly 130,000, and that by 1776 it was rather more than 300,000.² The causes that, at a later period, gave a much greater extension to American slavery, and the philanthropic movement in opposition to the slave trade, will find their place in a later portion of this book. In the first half of the eighteenth century the colonial opposition to the importation of slaves arose almost exclusively from economical and political reasons—from the effect of the excessive supply upon prices, and from the grave dangers resulting from the presence of a vast population of captives. In 1711 there was a violent panic in New York, and nineteen victims perished, on account of an alleged negro plot to burn the city.³ In 1738 a serious insurrection of negroes was excited by the Spaniards in South Carolina, and the colonists of Jamaica were compelled to make a treaty with fugitive slaves whom they were unable to subdue.⁴ A few isolated protests against

elder Pitt: 'Whereas the trade to and from Africa is very advantageous to Great Britain, and necessary for the supplying the plantations and colonies thereunto belonging with a sufficient number of negroes at reasonable prices.' See, on this subject, Rose's *Diaries*, i. 38. Bancroft,

iii. 413, 414.

¹ Bancroft's *Hist. of the United States*, iii. 407–416.

² *Ibid*, iii. 407.

³ Hildreth, *Hist. of the United States*, ii. 267.

⁴ Holmes' *Annals of America*, ii. 10, 11.

slavery based on religious principles were heard, but they had no echo from the leading theologians. Jonathan Edwards, who occupied the first place among those born in America, left, among other property, a negro boy. Berkeley had slaves when in Rhode Island, and appears to have felt no scruples on the subject, though he protested, with his usual humanity, against 'the irrational contempt of the blacks.'¹ The article in the charter of Georgia forbidding slavery, being extremely unpopular among the colonists, was repealed in 1749; and it is melancholy to record that one of the most prominent and influential advocates of the introduction of slavery into the colony was George Whitefield. In Georgia there was an express stipulation for the religious instruction of the slaves; it is said that those in or about Savannah have always been noted in America for their piety,² and the advantage of bringing negroes within the range of the Gospel teaching was a common argument in favour of the slave trade. The Protestants from Salzburg for a time had scruples, but they were reassured by a message from Germany: 'If you take slaves in faith,' it was said, 'and with intent of conducting them to Christ, the action will not be a sin, but may prove a benediction.'³ In truth, however, but little zeal was shown in the work of conversion. Many who cordially approved of the slavery of pagans questioned whether it was right to hold Christians in bondage; there was a popular belief that baptism would invalidate the legal title of the master to his slave,⁴ and there was

¹ Fraser's *Life of Berkeley*, pp. 187, 188.

² Hildreth, ii. 417-419.

³ Ibid.

⁴ See Hildreth's *Hist. of the United States*, ii. 426. Bancroft, iii. 409. South Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland passed laws

expressly asserting that baptism made no change in the legal position of the negro; an opinion of Yorke and Talbot, the English law officers, to the same effect was circulated in the colonies; and Gibson, the Bishop of London, declared that 'Christianity

a strong and general fear lest any form of education should so brace the energies of the negro as to make him revolt against his lot. Of the extent to which this latter feeling was carried, one extraordinary instance of a later period may be given. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel sent missionaries to convert the free negroes in Guinea, on the Gold Coast, and in Sierra Leone; but it was itself a large slave-owner, possessing numerous slaves on an estate in Barbadoes. In 1783 Bishop. Porteus strongly urged upon the managers of the Society the duty of at least giving Christian instruction to these slaves; but, after a full discussion, the recommendation was absolutely declined.¹

In the American States slavery speedily gravitated to the South. The climate of the Southern provinces was eminently favourable to the negroes; and the crops, and especially the rice crop—which had been introduced into South Carolina from Madagascar in 1698—could hardly be cultivated by whites. In the Northern provinces the conditions were exactly reversed. We can scarcely have a better illustration of the controlling action of the physical on the moral world than is furnished by this fact. The conditions of climate which made the Northern provinces free States and the Southern provinces slave States established between them an intense social and moral repulsion, kindled mutual feelings of the bitterest hatred and contempt, and in our own day produced a war which threatened the whole future of American civilisation.

But in spite of these grave evils, the American provinces in the period I am describing were rapidly advancing. The old Puritanical fervour and simplicity, strengthened as it was by the influx of many persecuted

and the embracing of the Gospel does not make the least alteration in civil property.'

¹ Hodgson's *Life of Porteus*, pp. 86-88.

Protestants, may still be sometimes detected. At the close of the seventeenth century, 'travel, play, and work on the Lord's Day,' were prohibited in Massachusetts by law; and injunctions were given to constables 'to restrain all persons from swimming in the waters, unnecessary and unreasonable walking in the streets or fields of the town of Boston or other places, keeping open their shops or following their secular occasions or recreations in the evening preceding the Lord's Day, or any part of the said day or evening following.' Adultery was punished by public whipping and by compelling the culprit to wear a large A sewn on his coat.¹ In the following century we find in the same State one law for the suppression of lotteries, another for 'the prevention of idleness and immorality,' a third for discouraging extraordinary expenses at funerals and forbidding funeral scarves, a fourth prohibiting all dramatic representations.² The last Act was due to the indignation produced by some young Englishmen who got up, in a Boston coffee-house, a representation of Otway's 'Orphan;' and it is worthy of notice that professional acting was not introduced into the English colonies of America till 1752. A London theatrical company then visited the colonies, but the law prohibited them from appearing in Massachusetts or Connecticut.³

In general, however, the increase of wealth was bringing with it a more luxurious type of civilisation which often surprised the traveller from England,⁴ and the standard of intelligence was very high. In 1721, in the very year when inoculation first appeared in England, it was introduced into Boston by Cotton Mather.⁵ Having

¹ Hildreth, ii. 169.

² Holme's *Annals of America*, i. 524, 534; ii. 42. Hildreth, ii. 407.

³ Hildreth, ii. 407.

⁴ See Grahame's *Hist. of the United States*, iii. 153.

⁵ Holmes' *Annals of America*, i. 527.

seen in the 'Transactions of the Royal Society' some letters from Turkey describing its advantages, he succeeded in inducing a physician named Boylston to join with him in his crusade; he obtained the support of the leading Puritan ministers at Boston, and in spite of a furious opposition—during which his life was more than once seriously threatened—he at last brought the practice into common use. It is a curious fact that Cotton Mather, who on this occasion showed himself so much in advance of his time, was the same man who, thirty years before, was the chief agent in the most ferocious persecution of witches ever known in America.¹ The first printing press in North America is said to have been set up at Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1638. Harvard College was founded in the same year, and it was followed in 1693 by William and Mary College, in Virginia, and in 1701 by Yale College, in Connecticut.² Free schools had early been established in New England, and in the beginning of the eighteenth century an American press gradually grew up. The first American newspaper appeared at Boston in 1704, and by 1740 there were eleven in the colonies.³ A considerable public library was founded at Philadelphia in 1742, and another at Newport in Rhode Island in 1747.⁴ Franklin, the greatest natural philosopher and one of the greatest writers America has produced, about this time rose to notice; and his discovery in 1752 of the

¹ Hildreth, ii. 300, 301. The *Courant*—a newspaper edited by a brother of Franklin—strongly opposed inoculation. Benjamin Franklin was then working as an apprentice with his brother, and there is an old Boston tradition that he wrote something on the same side.—Miller's *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century* (English edition, 1805), i. 356.

² The history of American education has been very fully treated in the third volume of Miller's *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, a valuable American book which does not deserve the neglect into which it has fallen.

³ Bancroft, iii. 374, 375.

⁴ Holmes, ii. 21–35.

lightning-conductor was probably the most important that any British subject had made for more than a generation. Jonathan Edwards, the most acute of American metaphysicians, was now in the zenith of his fame; and when, a few years later, the hour arrived for the final rupture with England, it was found that the British colonies had formed a generation of men who were fully competent to guide the destinies of a nation.

The American provinces were by far the most important of the English colonies, and England, as a colonial Power, had in the first half of the eighteenth century no pretensions to that complete pre-eminence which she afterwards obtained. Spain and Portugal, indeed, the great colonial Powers of the past, though still possessing mighty territories, were already in their decadence; but France, from the time of Colbert, had entered vigorously into the field, and Holland in a great part of the world considerably overbalanced the influence of England. In that great Indian Empire which now counts more than 200 millions of subjects, England in the middle of the century possessed little more than Bombay, Madras, Fort William in Bengal, and a few scattered factories. The whole coast, ports, and forts of the rich island of Ceylon were in the hands of the Dutch, whose factories rivalled those of England on the mainland, and who had acquired dominion, influence, or commercial preponderance in the Spice Islands, in Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, and many neighbouring islands, in the peninsula of Malacca, and in the kingdoms of Siam and of Aracan. The Dutch at this time almost monopolised the important trade in cinnamon, nutmegs, cloves, and spice; they were the only Europeans who had commercial relations with Japan, and in Africa they were the sovereigns of the Cape of Good Hope.

The French colonies at Pondicherry, the Isle of France, and the Isle of Bourbon, fostered as they were by the skill of Dupleix and La Bourdonnais, seriously threatened the English dominions in Hindostan, and, as we have seen, Madras was at one time in their power. The two English East India Companies whose rivalry played so great a part in the politics of the years that followed the Revolution, had been amalgamated in 1702. Among the articles imported from India were printed and dyed calicoes, which began to come into fashion in England under William and Mary, and the demand for them was soon so great as for a few years to add very largely to Indian prosperity. But the jealousy of the manufacturers at home was soon aroused, and as usual they speedily succeeded in crushing the rival trade. A law passed in 1699, and renewed in 1721, absolutely prohibited under severe penalties the use of all Indian silks, stuffs, and printed or dyed calicoes in apparel, household stuffs, or furniture in England.¹ The island of St. Helena, which had been abandoned by the Dutch in 1651, proved of great importance as a station for provisioning English ships to India, and there were a few English factories along the Persian Gulf, and in the islands of Borneo and Sumatra.

In the West Indies it was estimated towards the middle of the eighteenth century that the English possessions contained about 90,000 whites and at least 230,000 negroes.² Jamaica, which was the most important of the British islands, had long been a favourite resort of the buccaneers or pirates who infested the Spanish waters. It derived great wealth from its clandestine trade with Spanish America, and it was one of

¹ 11 & 12 William III. c. 10; 7 George I. c. 7. *pean Settlements in America* (6th ed.), ii. 117.

² Burke's *Account of the Euro-*

the chief depots of the slave trade. Its government was the most valuable in the gift of the Crown, next to that of Ireland, the total emoluments of the post being little less than 10,000*l.* a year. The prosperity of the island, however, had been clouded by some great calamities, and its old capital, Port Royal, had three times in thirty years been reduced to ruins. It had been destroyed by a great earthquake in 1692, by a great fire about ten years later, and by a terrific hurricane in 1722. From this time the seat of government was transferred to Kingston. Barbadoes, which ranked next to Jamaica in importance and before it in the date of its settlement, was much more thickly populated in proportion to its size, but it seems to have somewhat declined since the period of the Restoration. Shortly after that event Charles II. had marked his sense of its importance by creating no less than thirteen baronets out of its leading men. The growth of the French sugar islands, the settlement of Antigua, St. Christopher, Nevis, and Montserrat, the progress of Jamaica, and a great pestilence which swept over the island in 1692, diminished the relative importance of Barbadoes, but it still carried on a large trade in sugar, rum, molasses, cotton, ginger, and aloes, and it supported a militia of near 5,000 men. The Anglican religion was established in each of the English West India Isles. The system of government was like that in the Crown colonies of America. Each island possessed a representative assembly, and although they were much hampered by the commercial policy of the mother country, they enjoyed in their internal affairs a large measure of self-government.¹ It was computed in 1734 that the English sugar islands produced annually about 85,000 hogsheads of

¹ See an excellent description of these islands in Burke's *Account of the European Settlements in America*.

sugar, that 300 sail of ships visited them every year from Great Britain besides those from the English colonies, and that they annually received British manufactures to the value of 240,000*l*.¹ There were, however, bitter complaints that the French sugar plantations of St. Domingo, Guadeloupe, Martinico, and other less considerable islands, had so rapidly increased that they rivalled or surpassed those of England.²

Much more important to England than any changes that were effected in these distant colonies were those which were produced nearer home. No period in the history of Scotland is more momentous than that between the Revolution and the middle of the eighteenth century, for in no other period did Scotland take so many steps on the path that leads from anarchy to civilisation. In the beginning of the eighteenth century the Highlands were almost wholly inaccessible to the traveller. They were for the most part traversed only by rude horse-tracks, without any attempt to diminish the natural difficulties of the country. They were inhabited by a population speaking a language different from that of England, scarcely ever intermarrying with Lowlanders, living habitually with arms in their hands, sunk in the lowest depths of barbarism, and divided into a number of kingdoms, that were practically as distinct and independent as those of the Heptarchy. By law the chief had an hereditary jurisdiction over his vassals extending ‘to the pit and to the gallows,’ to the execution of capital punishment by drowning and hanging; but the law was a very feeble and inadequate expression of his real power. It is, indeed, no exaggeration to say that the decisions of Parliament and of the tribunals were long absolutely inoperative in the High-

¹ Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 200.

² *Ibid.* iii. 262, 263.

lands. The chief could determine what king, what government, what religion his vassals should obey; his word was the only law they respected; a complete devotion to his interests, an absolute obedience to his commands, was the first and almost the single article of their moral code. Combining in his own person the characters of king, general, landlord, and judge, he lived with his vassals on terms of the utmost familiarity, but he ruled them with all the authority of an Oriental despot, and he rarely appeared abroad without a retinue of ten or twelve armed men.¹ The law could never touch him. Captain Burt, who visited the Highlands about 1730, found an English footman, who had been lured to the Highlands, enslaved by one of these chiefs, and his return to freedom was hopeless. Sometimes the chief had a regular executioner in his service,² and for the slightest cause he could have those who offended him either deliberately assassinated or executed after a mock trial, conducted by his own followers. Sometimes he would grant the temporary use of his power to his guest, and promise him the pleasure of seeing anyone who had offended him hanging next morning before his window, unless he preferred his head as a memorial

¹ 'The ordinary Highlanders esteem it the most sublime degree of virtue to love their chief and pay him blind obedience, although it be in opposition to the Government, the laws of the kingdom, or even the law of God. He is their idol, and as they profess to know no king but him (I was going further), so will they say they ought to do whatever he commands without inquiry.' —Burt's *Letters from the North of Scotland* (5th ed.), ii. 2, 3. See, too, Marshal Wade's 'Reports on the Highlands,' ap-

ended to Burt, ii. 270, and the vivid picture by Dr. Johnson, *Tour to the Hebrides* (ed. 1817), pp. 130-137.

² 'There is still to be seen among the papers of the family of Perth an application from the town of Perth to Lord Drummond, dated in 1707, requesting an occasional use of his Lordship's executioner, who was considered an expert operator. The request was granted, his Lordship reserving to himself the power of recalling him whenever he had occasion for his services.'—

of Highland courtesy.¹ 'Almost every chief,' said a traveller, 'had in some remote valley, in the depths of woods and rocks, whole tribes of thieves in readiness to let loose against his neighbours when, for some public or private reason, he did not judge it expedient to resent openly some real or imaginary affront.'²

Not unfrequently the chiefs increased their scanty incomes by kidnapping boys or men, whom they sold as slaves to the American planters.³ Generations of an idle and predatory life had produced throughout the Highlands the worst vices of barbarians. The slightest provocation was avenged with blood. Fierce contests between chiefs and clans were perpetuated from age to age, and the pile of stones, which marked the spot where a Highlander had fallen, preserved through many generations the memory of the feud.⁴ In war the Highlanders usually gave no quarter. Their savage, merciless ferocity long made them the terror of their neighbours.⁵ Few episodes in British history are more terrible than that which occurred in 1678, when Lauderdale let loose 8,000 Highlanders to punish the

Stewart's *Sketches of the Character of the Highlanders* (3rd ed.), i. 52.

¹ See Burt's *Letters*, and the description of Highland manners in Burton's *Hist. of Scotland since the Revolution*.

² Pennant's *Second Tour in Scotland*. Pinkerton's *Voyages*, iii. 349.

³ Burton's *Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 407-411.

⁴ Burt, ii. 10, 11. Another English traveller writes: 'Many gentlemen in the Highlands shun one another's company, lest they should revive a quarrel that happened between their forefathers, perhaps 300 years

ago.'—Macky's *Journey through Scotland*, p. 128.

⁵ See a horrible catalogue of Highland cruelties in Macaulay, c. xviii. 'That the Highlanders,' says Captain Burt, 'for the most part are cruel is beyond dispute, though all clans are not alike merciless. In general they have not generosity enough to give quarter to an enemy that falls in their power. Nor do they seem to have any remorse at shedding blood without necessity' (ii. 77). The same writer gives numerous horrible instances of their cruelty both to English soldiers and to each other. See, too, Johnson's *Tour*, p. 140.

obstinate Presbyterianism of the western counties by living in free quarters among them. For three months they committed every variety of atrocity that human malignity could conceive; torturing some with thumb-screws, scorching others before vast fires, tearing children from their mothers, foully abusing women, plundering and devastating everything within their range.¹ Far into the eighteenth century no stranger could settle among the clans. If he did, his house was burnt, his cattle were killed or maimed, and he himself was happy if he escaped with life.² Manual labour was looked upon with contempt. Most forms of field labour were habitually done by the women, while the husband and the son looked on in idleness, or devoted themselves to robbing or begging.³ Plunder was the passion, the trade, the romance of the Highlander. In war his admirable courage and endurance were almost neutralised by the predatory instinct that led him in the midst of the battle to turn aside to plunder the wounded or

¹ Wodrow's *Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, ii.

² Burt's *Letters*, ii. 72-75, 225.

³ See a striking statement in Burt, ii. 44, 45. Fletcher of Saltoun writes: 'Nor, indeed, can there be a thorough reformation in this affair so long as the one half of our country, in extent of ground, is possessed by a people who are all gentlemen only because they will not work, and who in everything are more contemptible than the vilest slaves, except that they always carry arms, because for the most part they live upon robbery. This part of the country, being an inexhaustible source of beggars, has always broken all our measures relating to them.'—*Second Discourse on*

the Affairs of Scotland. Pennant, when he visited Scotland in 1769 and 1772, noticed the same traits, though in diminished intensity, and especially observed how at Caithness 'the tender sex are the only animals of burden.'—Pinkerton's *Voyages*, iii. 89-94. Another writer, who visited the Highlands in 1774, says: 'An Highlander will to this day wrap himself up in his plaid, throw himself at his length on the ground and lie there totally unconcerned, while his wife and children are busily engaged in getting in the scanty harvest which the barren nature of his land allows him.'—Topham's *Letters from Edinburgh*, pp. 43, 44.

the dead, or to fly in the most critical moments to his mountain fastnesses in order to secure his booty.

Lord Kames has very happily observed that the Highlanders, till after the rebellion of 1745, were precisely in the moral condition of the Germans as described by Cæsar, among whom robbery carried with it no reproach, if it were committed beyond the borders of their canton or their tribe.¹ The whole line of the Lowlands contiguous to the Highlands was infested with predatory bands, driving off, or as it was termed 'lifting' cattle, especially at Michaelmas, when they were in a fit condition for the market. These expeditions carried with them no sense of immorality and dishonour, and when undertaking them the Highlanders, it was said, 'prayed as earnestly to Heaven for success as if they were engaged in the most laudable design.'² At one time every young chief, on coming of age, was expected in this manner to prove his manhood.³ From this source the chiefs obtained the rewards for their numerous followers, and sometimes dowries for their daughters. A regular tribute, called 'black mail,' was paid in defiance of the law, to some neighbouring chief, by most of the Lowlanders whose land adjoined the Highlands, to secure them against depredations. If it were neglected, the cattle of the farmer were soon driven away, and the only hope of recovering them was by the payment of 'tascall,' or compensation money, to some powerful Highlander. Even if the thieves were captured, they were seldom prosecuted, for few farmers dared to incur the vengeance of the clan, who would descend by night

¹ *History of Man*, bk. ii. c. i.

² Pennant (Pinkerton's *Voyages*, iii. 348). There is an interesting examination of the moral notions of the Highlanders on this subject in Stewart's

Sketches of the Character of the Highlanders, i. 36-48.

³ Martin's Description of the Western Islands (Pinkerton's *Voyages*, iii. 607).

to burn the houses and to hough the cattle of those who offended them. It was computed in 1747 that cattle to the value of 5,000*l.* were annually stolen in this manner from the Lowland border; that the expense of fruitless efforts to recover them amounted to at least 2,000*l.*; that the additional expense of herds and watchmen to guard against the Highlanders was about 10,000*l.*; that 5,000*l.* was annually paid in black mail; and that the lands were understocked by reason of thefts to such an extent as amounted to a loss of at least 15,000*l.*¹ Of the extraordinary impotence of the law in the early years of the eighteenth century, even in the southern extremity of the Highlands, we have a striking instance in the career of Robert Macgregor, the well-known Rob Roy. For more than twenty years he carried on a private war with the Duke of Montrose, driving away his cattle, intercepting his rents, levying contributions on his tenants, and sometimes, in broad daylight, carrying away his servants. He did this—often under the protection of the Duke of Argyle—in a country that was within thirty miles of the garrison towns of Stirling and Dumbarton, and of the important city of Glasgow, and although a small garrison had been planted at Inversnaid for the express purpose of checking his depredations. He at last died peacefully on his bed in 1736 at the patriarchal age of eighty.

If such things could be on the borders of Loch Lomond, we can easily imagine the barbarous condition of the North. The very rudiments of civilisation had scarcely penetrated to the mountains. From Dunkeld to Inverness, which was about one hundred miles, and

¹ See 'An Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of Rebellions in the Highlands,' appended to Burt's *Letters* (5th ed.), ii. 359. Also the review of Marshal

Wade's proceedings in the Highlands, Burt, ii. 126-130; and Lord Lovat's report to George I. in 1724 on the *State of the Highlands*.

from thence to the Western Sea, including the western islands, there was in the middle of the eighteenth century not a single town or village that could contain the rudest court of justice, nor was there any inn or other accommodation for travellers till a few were built by General Wade shortly after the rebellion of 1715. Of this large tract of country, no part was cultivated except a few spots in straths or glens, by the sides of rivers, brooks, or lakes, and on the sea coast and in the western islands.¹ The population lived by the produce of their cattle, or by the chase. Iron was hardly known, except in the form of weapons. The plough was a piece of wood that scratched the earth; the spades were made of wood; table-knives were rarely or never laid upon the table. The only mills for grinding corn were hand-querns turned by a woman's hand.² In some of the Western Highlands the harrow was attached to the tail of the horse, and drawn without any harness whatever.³ The rents were usually paid in kind.⁴ Potatoes, except as a rare garden vegetable, were unknown in Scotland till after the rebellion of 1745, when the Irish fashion of cultivating them in the open field was introduced,

¹ *Culloden Papers*, p. 298.

² Burton's *Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 395, 396. 'Table knives,' wrote Dr. Johnson, 'were not regularly laid on the table before the prohibition of arms and the change of dress. Thirty years ago the Highlander wore his knife as a companion to his dirk or dagger, and when the company sat down to meat, the men who had knives cut the flesh into small pieces for the women, who with their fingers conveyed it to their mouths.'—Johnson's *Tour to the Hebrides*, p. 84. I may add that the eccentric Duchess of Queensberry (the friend and

patroness of Gay) was accustomed, when at Edinburgh, to express very emphatically her disgust at the Scotch fashion, still prevailing in the capital, of eating off the end of a knife.—Chambers' *Traditions of Edinburgh*.

³ Burt's *Letters*, ii. 43. Pennant found this barbarous custom prevailing in Skye as late as 1772 (Second Tour in Scotland).—Pinkerton's *Voyages*, iii. 318.

⁴ Defoe's *Hist. of the Union*. Johnson's *Tour*, p. 174. Burt's *Letters*, ii. 52.

and they gradually became the chief article of food among the labouring poor;¹ field turnips were extremely rare;² wheat was confined to the Lowlands;³ and, except some scanty crops of oats, cattle were almost the only form of Highland produce. In the complete absence of all industrial pursuits, there were few purchasers and few changes, but a dead level of the most abject poverty. In bad seasons a little milk and a small quantity of oatmeal were mixed with blood drawn from a living cow, and boiled together into cakes.⁴ When Captain Burt visited the Highlands he found in some places the cattle so weak from want of food and from immoderate bleeding, that in the morning they could not rise from the ground, and the inhabitants joined together to help up each other's cows.⁵ In the islands and on the coast shell-fish were largely eaten, and in the interior of the Highlands the peasants lived chiefly on oatmeal and milk. The filth of their persons, their cabins, and their cookery was described as revolting; and it is a curious fact that one of the consequences of the invasion of England in 1745 that was most dreaded, was the spread of the cutaneous diseases that accompanied the Highlanders wherever they went.⁶ Their cabins had no chimneys, but only holes for the escape of the smoke. During the long winters they had no diversions, but sat brooding in the smoke over the fire till their legs and thighs were completely scorched, and till they grew as black as chimney-

¹ Compare *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century* from the MSS. of John Ramsay of Ochertyre, ii. 246. Stewart *On the Highlanders of Scotland* (3rd ed.), i. 146.

² Stewart, i. 146.

³ Burton, ii. 395. Johnson's *Tour*, p. 120. Burt's *Letters*. It is curious that while Burt

speaks of the complete absence of wheat in his time in the Highlands, Boethius had mentioned the country round Inverness as specially fertile in this crop.—*Culloden Papers*, p. xx.

⁴ Burt's *Letters*, ii. 28

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 30, 31.

⁶ Burton, ii. 480.

sweepers. Sore eyes and frequent blindness were the natural consequence, and they had no candles, though resinous sticks were sometimes employed in their place.¹ The islands were, if possible, even more barbarous than the mainland. In some of them it was said beef was boiled in the hide, and fowls roasted with their feathers.² The sheep were not shorn, but the wool was torn from the living animals.³ The Shetland Islands during the whole winter were cut off from all communication with the mainland. The landing of William in Torbay in November 1688 is said only to have been known in Zetland in the following May.⁴

In some of these islands and in several of the remoter valleys of the Highlands the Catholic worship lingered on during the greater part of the eighteenth century, and although the Scotch Kirk gradually extended its empire, it found it much more easy to extirpate the worship and the dogmas than the popular superstitions of the old faith. A strange mixture of Pagan and Popish notions long continued to blend with the new creed. A Presbyterian minister who visited the northern islands in the beginning of the eighteenth century relates with much horror that in one parish of Orkney the people attached such a reverence to the remains of a ruined and roofless chapel called Our Lady's Kirk, containing a stone which was said to bear the footprints of St. Magnus, that it was found necessary even in the wildest weather to conduct the Presbyterian service there, as the congregation refused to attend it in any other place.⁵ In another island the minister was

¹ Burt's *Letters*, ii. 34, 35.

² Burt's *Letters*, p. 173.

³ Brand's description of Orkney, Zetland, &c., in Pinkerton, iii. 770. Sinclair's *Statistical Account of Scotland*, i. 392, v.

410.

⁴ Brand's description of Orkney, &c. (1701), Pinkerton, iii. 773.

⁵ Ibid. (Pinkerton, iii. 762, 763).

given his choice from all the young seals that were taken, and that which he selected was called 'cullen Mory,' or 'the Virgin Mary's seal.'¹ The lark was known as Our Lady's hen.² The belief in charms, in holy wells, in second sight, in sacred spots, in holy or unholy seasons, was almost as general as in a Catholic country. Lunatics were dipped in the well of St. Fillan or of Inch Maree.³ The faces of the sick were fanned with the leaves of a Bible.⁴ On a particular day in harvest time it was believed that if anyone worked, the ridges would bleed.⁵ An impostor in the island of St. Kilda carried away a large proportion of the inhabitants, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, by a pretended revelation from St. John the Baptist, enjoining among other things a careful observance of saint-days and a weekly fast, and reviving the doctrine of the intercession of the saints; and it was noticed that if any change should give a renewed ascendancy to Popery the people were thoroughly prepared to embrace it.⁶ Other superstitions partook largely of paganism. The clans were summoned to war by the fiery cross dipped in blood with those mystic rites which the great Scotch poet has made so familiar. As late as 1745 it was sent round Loch Tay by Lord Breadalbane to summon his clansmen to support the Government.⁷ Traces of the old forms of sacrifice may be found in the custom, which has lingered even to our own century, of burying a cock alive where an epileptic first fell, of burying one cow alive in order to

¹ Martin's Description of the Western Islands (Pinkerton, iii. 594).

² Brand (Pinkerton, iii. 763).

³ See Arthur Michell's very interesting paper on 'Superstitions of the North-west Highlands of Scotland,' in the fourth volume of the Antiquarian Society of Scotland.

⁴ Martin's description (Pinkerton, iii. 653).

⁵ Brand's description (Pinkerton, iii. 763).

⁶ Martin and Brand (Pinkerton, iii. 725-728, 763).

⁷ Stewart's *Sketches of the Highlanders of Scotland*, i. append. xi.

save a herd stricken by the murrain.¹ On May-day a strange ceremony was performed, in which a libation was poured out on the ground, and offerings were made for the preservation of the horses and sheep, and to propitiate the fox, the hooded crow, and the eagle.² The belief in witches and in fairies was universal. Tarans, or souls of unbaptised infants, were believed to wander disconsolate over the hills, and spirit voices, singing Irish songs, to be heard during the night in the lonely valleys.³ Spirits in the shape of tall men with long brown hair, known as Brownies, played a very large part in the Highland mythology, were propitiated by libations of milk, and were sometimes consulted in difficulty by a man sewn up in a cow's hide and placed during the night in the hollow under a cataract to await the answer to his inquiry.⁴

The great virtue of the Highlander was his fidelity to his chief and to his clan. It took the place of patriotism and of loyalty to the Sovereign. It was unbroken by the worst excesses of tyranny, and it was all the more admirable on account of the extreme poverty which, after the Union, made the Scotch nobles a laughing-stock in England. In the reign of James V., an insurrection of Clan Chattan having been suppressed by Murray, 200 of the insurgents were condemned to death. Each one as he was led to the gallows was offered a pardon if he would reveal the hiding-place of his chief, but they all answered that, were they acquainted with it, no sort of punishment could induce them to be guilty of treachery

¹ Michell on *Superstitions of the North-west Highlands*. Dalzell's *Darker Superstitions of Scotland*. Michell states that these sacrifices are even now not unknown in some parts of Scotland.

² Pennant's Tour (Pinkerton,

iii. 49).

³ Martin (Pinkerton, iii. 681).

⁴ Ibid. (Pinkerton, iii. 610, 611). Many other curious instances of Highland superstitions will be found in Ramsay's *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*.

to their leader. In the rebellion of 1715 an extraordinary example of the power of the chief was furnished by the career of the well-known Simon Fraser, afterwards Lord Lovat. He was personally very indifferent to the rival claimants of the throne. Having committed a rape on the sister of the Duke of Athol, and afterwards been mixed up in a Jacobite plot, he had lived for many years in exile in France, but had fallen into suspicion with the Court of St. Germain, and at last resolved, for this and for a still more personal reason, to go over to the Hanoverian side. By the law of Highland allegiance he was the head of the Fraser clan, but the English law had given his estates to the daughter of the last Lord Lovat, who had married Mackenzie of Fraserdale. Mackenzie, by virtue of his marriage, claimed the territorial influence of the head of the Frasers. He took the Jacobite side in the rebellion, and had actually led a great portion of the clan to join the camp of Lord Mar, when Simon Fraser appeared upon the scene. The effect was instantaneous. Although he had long been absent from the country, although he had himself hitherto been a Jacobite, the Frasers at once obeyed his summons, abandoned the army of the Pretender, and took a conspicuous part on the Hanoverian side. Not less remarkable on the other side was the case of the Macleans. Their land had for more than forty years been vested for debt in the Duke of Argyle. Their chief had not retained an acre of ground. He had spent most of his life in France, and had latterly been maintained in London by the charity of Queen Anne. Yet Sir John Maclean was able as head of the clan to summon 400 men to fight for the Pretender, although the Hanoverian army was commanded by their own landlord, the Duke of Argyle. For many years after the estates of Lord Seaforth had been forfeited for his participation in the rebellion of 1715, his rents were regularly collected by his tenants and trans-

mitted to the Continent to their exiled lord. In 1745 the house of Macpherson of Cluny was burnt to the ground by the King's troops. A reward of 1,000*l.* was offered for his apprehension. A large body of soldiers was stationed in the district, and a step of promotion was promised to any officer who should secure him. Yet for nine years the chief was able to live concealed on his own property in a cave which his clansmen dug for him during the night, and, though upwards of one hundred persons knew of his place of retreat, no bribe or menace could extort the secret; till at last, wearied of the long and dreary solitude and despairing of pardon, he took refuge in France.¹

It needs no argument to show how dangerous, how incompatible with all national unity and with all security, was this absolute devotion of the clansmen to their chief. It is, however, equally manifest that it implied a moral quality of a high order. It grew out of a state of society in which the dignity of the noble depended, not on any display of pageantry or wealth, but solely on the number and affection of his people—in which the humblest clansman claimed consanguinity with his chief, bore his name and identified himself with his glory. Chivalrous, self-sacrificing fidelity was the great virtue of the Highlands, and the education of the clan life made it at last a distinguishing feature of the Scotch character. For a long time, however, the influence of the Highlands and the Lowlands on each other was chiefly an influence of repulsion, and it is curious to contrast the conduct of the Scotch Parliament, which, with

¹ See Lord Lovat's *Memorial of the State of the Highlands*. Pennant's *Tour* (Pinkerton, iii. 384). Chambers' *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, iii. 459. Stew-

art *On the Highlanders of Scotland*, i. 62, 63, and append. xlviii. Ramsay's *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 506.

the assent of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, surrendered Charles I. for money to the Republicans, with that of those poverty-stricken Highlanders, among whom the Pretender wandered helplessly for five months at a time when a reward of 30,000*l.* was offered for his apprehension.

Of the high military qualities of the Highlanders it is scarcely necessary to speak, and they were probably shared to the full extent by the inhabitants of the Lowlands. Great courage, great power of enduring both privation and pain,¹ great fire and impetuosity in attack were abundantly shown; but the discipline of a regular army was required to add to these that more than English tenacity which has placed the Scotchman in the first rank of European soldiers. The prowess of the nation had been displayed in many glorious fields both at home and abroad. Crowds of Scotch adventurers, impelled by poverty, ambition, or internal feuds, had from a very early date been scattered over Europe.² Many had taken part in the Crusades. Great numbers, from the days of St. Lewis till near the close of the seventeenth century, were enlisted in the service of France. They may be traced in the armies of Germany, Italy, and Russia, and Scotchmen were conspicuous among the bravest soldiers of Gustavus Adolphus.³ More than 3,000 Scotchmen under Lord

¹ I have heard one of the most eminent of English surgeons state as the result of his experience, that he found a wide difference in the power of enduring pain shown by patients from different parts of the British Empire, and that he has usually found his Scotch patients in this respect greatly superior both to his English and to his Irish ones.

² There was an old French

proverb—

Que d'Écossois, de rats, de poux,
Ceux qui voyagent jusqu'au bout
Du monde, en rencontrent partout.
Michel, *Les Écossois en France*, l. p. 4.

³ An immense amount of information about Scotchmen abroad will be found in Michel's *Écossois en France*. See, too, Stewart's *Sketches of the Highlanders*, ii. 409-418; Defoe's *Memoirs of an English Cavalier*; Macky's *Journey in Scotland*.

Reay, the Laird of Fowlis, and other Highland gentlemen, followed his banner, and they fought so desperately that scarcely one in ten outlived the field of Lützen. Their military qualities, however, were more recognised abroad than at home, and no statesman in the beginning of the eighteenth century appears yet to have foreseen that the Highland valleys, which were still looked upon as mere nests of thieves, would become one day among the most valuable recruiting-grounds of the British army.

A few other traits may be added which lighten the darkness of the picture. The Highlanders were distinguished for their hospitality to those who came properly recommended to them,¹ and several examples are recorded of the signal generosity of the inhabitants of the Western Islands to shipwrecked sailors at the very time when the practice of plundering wrecks was most scandalously prevalent on both the English and the Irish coasts.² Their natural grace of manner was beyond question, and popular poetry and much traditional lore produced among them some of the effects of education. They were comparatively free, too, from that spirit of bitter theological intolerance which was the bane of the Lowlands,³ and even their predatory habits were not unqualified or unrestricted. The 'lifting' of cattle was looked upon as a form of guerrilla warfare, and Captain Burt observed as a curious anomaly that 'the Highlander thinks it less shameful

¹ One great source of the proverbial hospitality of the Scotch chiefs and lairds was the prevalent custom of paying rent in kind.—See the 'Remarks on the Changes of Manners in my Time,' by Mrs. Mure, *Caldwell Papers*, i. 262.

² See some striking instances of this in Stewart's *Sketches of*

the Highlanders, i. append. xiii.—xvii. Ramsay notices that the Highlanders were in this respect most honourably distinguished from the inhabitants of the more civilised parts of the kingdom. *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 398.

³ Pennant (Pinkerton, iii. 426); Stewart, i. 105–108.

to steal 100 cows than one single sheep,' that 'personal robberies are seldom heard of among them,' and that he had himself frequently made long journeys in the Highlands accompanied by only a single servant, and with four hundred or five hundred guineas in his pormanteau, without any apprehension of robbers by the way, or any danger in his lodgings by night.¹

Among the greater chiefs there were, no doubt, a few who, from their intercourse with the Lowlands and with the Continent, had attained to a fair degree of culture; but for the most part the difficulties of travelling and the habits of clan life were sufficient to exclude even considerable men from all further contact with civilisation than could be obtained by rare visits to Inverness or perhaps to Aberdeen. The first of these towns was the real capital of the Highlands. It had been for some time occupied by Cromwell; and he was so sensible of its importance as a military post for keeping the tribes in subjection that he strengthened it by a fortress, which took five years in its erection, and is said to have cost not less than 80,000*l.*, but which, at the petition of the Highland chiefs, was at once levelled at the Restoration. More enduring consequences, ascribed to the invasion, were the excellent English long afterwards spoken in the town, and the prevalence of English manners among its people.²

¹ Burt's *Letters*, ii. 131-133. See, too, Stewart's *Sketches of the Highlanders*, i. 37-39. Ramsay's *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 494-496.

² 'The people speak as good English here [at Inverness] as at London, and with an English accent; and ever since Oliver Cromwell was here they are in their manners and dress entirely

English.' — Macky's *Journey through Scotland*, p. 123. See, too, Burt's *Letters*, i. 37. Chambers, however, attributes the good English spoken in Inverness 'to the simple circumstance that the people here do not learn English in their infancy through the medium of broad Scotch, but make a direct transition from Gaelic into pure English.' — *Gazetteer of Scotland*.

Inverness was one of the few towns which appear, at the time of the Revolution, to have been sincerely attached to Episcopacy. For ten years the population refused to allow any Presbyterian minister to effect a peaceful settlement among them, and the final establishment of the Kirk was not accomplished without the intervention of the troops.¹ In the beginning of the eighteenth century the town consisted of 400 or 500 thatched houses, with two churches, twelve maltkilns, and a wretched prison—so loathsome and so neglected that an unhappy prisoner is said, in 1715, to have been actually devoured by rats.² It carried on a considerable trade in malt, supplying the counties of Inverness, Ross, Sutherland, and Caithness, as well as the Orkney and Shetland Isles, and receiving in return large quantities of skins. Its prosperity, which was never very great, received a serious blow from the duties imposed on corn and afterwards from the malt tax; ruins of granaries and maltkilns were seen on every side, and to this fact we may in part attribute the strong Jacobitism of its inhabitants. The house which, during the troubles of 1745, was successively occupied by the Pretender and by the Duke of Cumberland is stated to have been then the only one in the town which contained a sitting-room or parlour without a bed in it. Inverness was so isolated from the Lowlands that there was no regular post between it and Edinburgh till the Union in 1707, and it was not till 1755

¹ Lawson's *Hist. of the Episcopal Church of Scotland*, p. 139.

² Fraser - Mackintosh's *Antiquarian Notes respecting the Highlands*, p. 16. No great improvement appears to have been effected till late in the century. In Dunbar's *Social Life in former Days, chiefly in the Province of*

Moray, illustrated by family papers (1865), there is a frightful contemporary picture of the state of Inverness prison in 1786. About thirty persons—some of them criminals and some of them debtors—were frequently confined in cells none of which were above 12 feet square (pp. 90-92).

that the post ceased to be carried on foot. It may be added that the coach of Lord Seaforth, which appeared in the town in 1715, was the first ever seen in its streets; that in 1740 its magistrates advertised for a saddler to settle in the borough, as there was then no such person among its inhabitants; and that the most ordinary form of cart was not introduced till 1778.¹

Aberdeen was a much more important town, but it lay outside the range of the wilder districts of the Highlands, and in spite of its northern situation it had all the characteristics of a Lowland city. Its constant communication by sea with the south and with the Continent, and also its admirable educational institutions, had raised it to a high level of civilisation. Its Grammar School was founded early in the fifteenth century, and King's College was the last of the three universities established in Scotland before the Reformation. It owed its origin to a letter of James IV., who represented to the Pope 'that the inhabitants of the Highlands were ignorant of letters and almost uncivilised; that there were no persons to be found fit to preach the Word of God to the people, or to administer the sacraments of the Church; and besides that, the country was so intersected with mountains and arms of the sea, and so distant from the universities already erected, and the roads so dangerous, that the youth had not access to the benefits of education in their seminaries.' At the same time the King suggested Old Aberdeen as a fitting site for the university, as being 'situated at a moderate distance from the Highland country and Northern islands.' The request was readily granted. A bull of Alexander VI.

¹ See on Inverness, the description in Burt's *Letters*, Sinclair's *Survey*, and Chambers' *Gazetteer of Scotland*; and also some curious facts collected from

other sources in Fraser-Mackintosh's *Antiquarian Notes respecting the Highlands* (Inverness, 1865).

was obtained, in which the Pope, having noticed that there were already two universities in Scotland, added, with much force, that ‘ while the distribution of other things lessened their power, science had this distinguishing quality, that the diffusion of it tended not to diminish but to increase and spread the general stock of knowledge.’ The university was formed after the model of that of Paris; its leading promoter was the Chancellor, Bishop Elphinstone, who had himself been professor at Paris and Orleans; and the first principal was Hector Boece, the friend of Erasmus and the historian of Scotland. After the Reformation, however, the distance of King’s College from the new town, and also the Catholic tendencies of its professors, produced a desire for a new university; and at the end of the sixteenth century Marischal College was founded. Even before the middle of the eighteenth century many eminent Scotchmen were connected with Aberdeen either by birth or by education. Jamesone, who is said to have been fellow-pupil with Vandyck in the school of Rubens, and who certainly was the first and for a long time the only considerable painter of Scotland, was a native of the city. Burnet and Arbuthnot were both educated in Marischal College, and the former, though but little connected with Scotland during his lifetime, showed his gratitude by founding eight bursarships in his will. Colin Maclaurin, one of the greatest mathematicians in Europe, was professor in the same college before his removal to Edinburgh in 1727. Reid was educated in Marischal College, and became professor in King’s College in 1752. The population of Aberdeen in 1755 was estimated at 15,730.¹ The first newspaper in the north of Scotland was established by its citizens in 1748. They had an important manufacture of woollen stockings, they exported to the

¹ Thom’s *Hist. of Aberdeen*, ii. 28.

Continent large quantities of salmon and pork, and they were less honourably noted for a scandalous system of decoying young boys from the country and selling them as slaves to the planters in Virginia. It was a trade which, in the early part of the eighteenth century, was carried on to a considerable extent through the Highlands;¹ and a case which took place about 1742 attracted much notice a few years later, when one of the victims, having escaped from servitude, returned to Aberdeen, and published a narrative of his sufferings, seriously implicating some of the magistracy of the town. He was prosecuted and condemned for libel by the local authorities, but the case was afterwards carried to Edinburgh. The iniquitous system of kidnapping was fully exposed, and the judges of the Supreme Court unanimously reversed the verdict of the Aberdeen authorities and imposed a heavy fine upon the provost, the four bailies, and the dean of the Guild.²

If we now turn to the Lowlands, we find their condition at least so far different from that of the Highlands that a real civilisation was generally diffused. The intellect, the industrial energy, the progressive instincts of Scotland were essentially Lowland; and in quiet times these guided the policy of the nation. Edinburgh, though still but a small town, excited the admiration of travellers who were acquainted with the greatest cities

¹ An atrocious case of this kind, which shows clearly the state of the Highlands, occurred in 1739. Nearly 100 men, women, and children were seized in the dead of the night on the islands of Skye and Herries, pinioned, horribly beaten, and stowed away in a ship bound for America, in order to be sold to the planters. Fortunately the ship touched at Donaghadee in Ireland, and the

prisoners, after undergoing the most frightful sufferings, succeeded in escaping. The case was fully investigated by Messrs. Ward and Baillie, two local magistrates, and their report is among the State Papers for Ireland in the English Record Office.

² See Kennedy's *Annals of Aberdeen*, i. 294-296.

of England and the Continent ; nor was their admiration entirely due to the singular beauty of its situation. The quaint architecture of the older houses—which sometimes rose to the height of nine, ten, or eleven stories—indeed, carried back the mind to very barbarous times ; for it was ascribed to the desire of the population to live as near as possible to the protection of the castle.¹ The filth of the streets in the early years of the eighteenth century was indescribable.² Southern writers were fond of expatiating on the dangers to the passers-by from the fetid torrents that were continually discharged from the windows ; and, long after the middle of the century had passed, they complained that the best inn in the capital of Scotland hardly ranked above an English alehouse.³ The new quarter, which now strikes every stranger by its spacious symmetry, was not begun till the latter half of the eighteenth century, but as early as 1723 an English traveller described the High Street as ‘ the

¹ Pennant (Pinkerton, iii. 28, 29).

² See Chambers’ *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, iii. 591–593.

³ An English traveller who lived at Edinburgh in 1774 and 1775, and who was in general greatly pleased with the town and with its inhabitants, says those who have been accustomed ‘ to the hotels of Paris and Lyons can scarcely form in imagination the distress of a miserable stranger on his first entrance into this city ; as there is no inn that is better than an alehouse, nor any accommodation that is decent, cleanly or fit to receive a gentleman. On our first arrival, my companion and myself, after a long day’s journey, were landed at one of these stable-keepers’

(for they have modesty enough to give them no higher denomination). . . . On entering the house we were conducted by a poor devil of a girl without shoes or stockings, and with only a single linsey-woolsey petticoat which just reached halfway to her ankles, into a room where about twenty Scotch drovers had been regaling themselves with whiskey and potatoes. You may guess our amazement when we were informed that this was the best inn in the metropolis—that we could have no beds unless we had an inclination to sleep together and in the same room with the company which a stage coach had that moment discharged.’ — Topham’s *Letters from Edinburgh*, p. 19.

stateliest street in the world,'¹ and even after the extinction of the Parliament, the law courts and the new university attracted to the capital most of the intellect and the refinement of the country. Under the influence of the Kirk the public manners of the town were marked by much decorum and even austerity, but the populace were unusually susceptible of fierce political enthusiasm, and when excited they were extremely formidable. The riots against the Union, the riot against the imposition of the malt tax in 1725, the well-known riot in which Captain Porteous was hanged by the mob, the riot in 1749 arising from some officers having, on the anniversary of Culloden, called for the tune of 'Culloden' in the theatre, were among the most serious in the kingdom during the first half of the eighteenth century. Political feeling, indeed, among all classes, appears to have run very high; and it was noticed that even the ladies took sides, and expressed their politics by the manner in which they wore their plaids.² Edinburgh, however, in the eighteenth century, could boast of a much more efficient police than London or any other English town. A city guard composed chiefly of fierce Highlanders armed and disciplined like regular soldiers, and placed under the control of the magistrates, was permanently established in 1696; and it was not finally abolished till the present century.³

Edinburgh, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, was more than twice as large as any other Scotch town. Its population at the time of the Union slightly exceeded 30,000, while that of Glasgow was not quite 15,000, that of Dundee not quite 10,000, and that of Perth about 7,000.⁴ A hard climate, a sterile soil, and a long continuance of singularly adverse circumstances,

¹ Macky's *Journey to Scotland* (1723), p. 65.

² Burt, i. 85.

³ Chambers' *Traditions of*

Edinburgh. Topham bears high testimony to the efficiency of this body as a police force.

⁴ Chalmers' *Caledonia*, i. 881

had formed among the people a character of indomitable energy which promised well for the future ; but as yet the condition of the Lowlands was extremely wretched. They lay between the anarchy of the Highlands and the anarchy of the border. To the north, the greater part of Scotland was occupied by predatory tribes, who continually descended to ravage their fields, who infested their streets as beggars, and who inoculated all classes with their habits of idleness, filth, and turbulence. To the south lay a much more wealthy and powerful nation, whose dealings towards them were usually inspired by implacable hatred or by the narrowest selfishness. Repeated English invasions had desolated the weaker land, and a chronic war subsisted for centuries along the border. The accession of a Scotch king to the English throne diminished these dangers, but it brought with it new evils scarcely less grave. In the interests of the English Church a long attempt was made to force Episcopacy, by savage persecution, upon a Presbyterian people. After the Restoration all religious worship by non-Episcopal ministers was for a time forbidden. A few ministers were afterwards restored by the Indulgence on terms which the more rigid members deemed it criminal to accept, but it was made a capital offence to preach in any conventicle, or even to attend a conventicle in the open air. The goods as well as the lives of all who were guilty of these offences were forfeited to the law, and no one could sit in Parliament or could vote for a Member of Parliament, who had not sworn an oath abjuring the principles of the Covenanters. Great numbers were killed, despoiled of their property, driven to the mountains, tortured with horrid ingenuity, or transported to the plantations ; and although the persecution failed as it deserved, it inflicted great and enduring calamities upon the nation, and among other consequences infused into it a spirit of fierce and gloomy

fanaticism. Besides this, the natural poverty and the unhappy position of Scotland could not save it from the commercial jealousy of its neighbour. Though part of the same empire, it was excluded from all trade with the English colonies; no goods could be landed in Scotland from the plantations unless they had been first landed in England, and paid duty there, and even then they might not be brought in a Scotch vessel. The trade with England itself was at the same time severely hampered. At the time of the Union, and even after the Scotch land tax had been increased in accordance with its provisions, the whole revenue of Scotland was only 160,000*l.*, while that of England was 5,691,000*l.*¹

The poverty, the abject misery of the country, was such that every bad season produced a literal famine. In 1698 and the three preceding years the harvests were very bad, and Fletcher of Saltoun—one of the greatest intellects and one of the most ardent patriots of Scotland—wrote a discourse on the state of the nation which throws a vivid light on the material wretchedness and the moral anarchy that prevailed. ‘Many thousands of our people,’ he said, ‘are at this day dying for want of bread . . . and though, perhaps, upon the great want of bread occasioned by the continued bad seasons of this and the three preceding years, the evil be greater and more pressing than at any time in our days, yet there have always been in Scotland such numbers of poor as by no regulations could ever be orderly provided for; and this country has always swarmed with such numbers of idle vagabonds as no laws could ever restrain.’ ‘There are at this day,’ he adds, ‘in Scotland (besides a great many poor families, very meanly provided for by the Church boxes, with others who by living upon bad food fall into various diseases) 200,000

¹ Stanhope's *Anne*, i. 281.

people begging from door to door. These are not only no way advantageous, but a very grievous burden to so poor a country; and though the number of them be perhaps double to what it was formerly by reason of this present great distress, yet in all times there have been about 100,000 of those vagabonds who have lived without any regard or subjection either to the laws of the land or even those of God and nature—fathers incestuously accompanying with their own daughters, the son with the mother, and the brother with the sister. No magistrate could ever discover or be informed which way one in a hundred of these wretches died, or that ever they were baptised. Many murders have been discovered among them, and they are not only a most unspeakable oppression to poor tenants (who, if they give not bread or some kind of provision to perhaps forty such villains in one day, are sure to be insulted by them), but they rob many poor people who live in houses distant from any neighbourhood. In years of plenty many thousands of them meet together in the mountains, where they feast and riot for many days; and at country weddings, markets, burials, and other the like public occasions, they are to be seen—both men and women—perpetually drunk, cursing, blaspheming, and fighting together.’¹

It is difficult for us to realise that these words were written less than 200 years ago by a great Scotch patriot, of a country which now ranks in social, industrial, and political virtues at the very head of the British Empire; nor would it be easy to find a more impressive illustration of the immense advance in human welfare which has during that period been achieved. The remedies which Fletcher of Saltoun deemed alone adequate to the evil are such as would even now in some

¹ *The Second Discourse on the Affairs of Scotland.*

quarters find much favour. He desired to reduce these wandering beggars and their children to a condition of slavery, to oblige every man of a certain estate to take a proportionate number, to hand over as an example 'three or four hundred of the most notorious of those villains which we call jockeys to the State of Venice to serve in the galleys' against the Turks, and, lastly, to transplant the whole population of the Highlands, whom he regarded as incorrigible, into the Low country, and to people the Highlands from thence. These measures, he said, should be prepared secretly, and taken rapidly, as otherwise those whom it was intended to enslave 'would rather die with hunger in caves and dens and murder their young children than appear abroad to have them and themselves taken into such a kind of service.' He might have added that such a policy would have inevitably produced a reaction of violence that would have intensified every evil it was intended to correct, and would have left behind it a hatred which would have rankled for centuries in the Scotch mind, and which generations of freedom and good government would have been unable to efface.

Very different was the course which was actually pursued. The series of measures which in a few generations raised Scotland from one of the most wretched and barbarous into one of the most civilised and happy nations in Europe may be soon told, and it forms one of the most striking examples of continued good legislation upon record. The Revolution brought into the ascendancy in England the party who were in alliance with the Dissenters, and the first great work was to put an end to the religious oppression of the people. The Act which made the religion of the immense majority of devout Scotchmen the established religion of their country closed for ever the darkest page in Scotch history, and terminated the opposition

between the authority of religion and the authority of law. It was soon followed by an Act establishing schools in every parish, which in a few years diffused the benefits of knowledge throughout the kingdom, and made the average level of Scotch intelligence superior to that of any other part of the Empire. The Tory ministry of Anne completed the work by a measure passed in a somewhat different spirit and in favour of another class, securing the Episcopal minority the undisturbed exercise of their religion.

The effect of these three measures can hardly be overrated. Of all the nations of Europe there was probably not a single one which, up to the time of the Revolution, was so violent, so turbulent, so difficult to govern as the Scotch.¹ It is not true, indeed, that the sentiment of loyalty was wanting among them, but it was a sentiment which found its object in the chief of the clan and not at all in the government of the nation.² Nor was the contemptuous repudiation of the English doctrine of passive obedience confined to the Highlanders. The Lowlanders in this respect scarcely differed from their northern fellow-countrymen, except in the more orderly and methodised character of their opposition. During the minority of James I. the well-

¹ 'There have been more rebellions in Scotland than in any other country, and the rebellions have been very sanguinary as well as very numerous. The Scotch have made war upon most of their kings, and put to death many. To mention their treatment of a single dynasty, they murdered James I. and James III. They rebelled against James II. and James VII. They laid hold of James V. and placed him in confinement. Mary they im-

mured in a castle and afterwards deposed. Her successor, James VI., they imprisoned; they led him captive about the country, and on one occasion attempted his life. Towards Charles I. they showed the greatest animosity, and they were the first to restrain his mad career.'—Buckle's *Hist. of Civilisation*, ii. 159.

² See the very just remarks of Macaulay on the difference between English and Scotch Jacobitism.—*Hist. c. xiii.*

known saying of Trajan when he delivered the sword to the governor of a province, 'Pro me ; si merear, in me,' was actually inscribed on the coin of the realm, and, although the King afterwards changed the motto, the coin was not called in, and continued to circulate till the Union.¹ Of all the considerable forms into which the Christian religion crystallised after the Reformation, the Scotch Kirk was the most violently, the most habitually, insubordinate to the civil power. It caught its colour from the spirit of the nation in which it rose. It was by its constitution essentially republican, deriving its theology chiefly from the Old Testament. It was in this respect the very antipodes to the Anglican Church and to the Gallican branch of the Catholic Church, both of which did all that lay in their power to consecrate despotism and to strengthen authority. Had the Scotch Kirk continued much longer to be oppressed and proscribed, had all the force and weight of religious sentiment been employed for several generations to enfeeble and to subvert the authority of the law, the effect upon the character of the nation would have been in the last degree pernicious. The habits produced by generations of misgovernment do not at once subside when the cause is removed ; and more than half a century of time and many other healing measures were required before Scotland became a really loyal country, but from the time when the Scotch Kirk became its established religion its condition was comparatively normal and healthy, and in spite of the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, the elements of turbulence began steadily to subside.

Scarcely less striking and beneficial in its effects was the second measure to which I have referred. The importance of a sound system of national education was

¹ Burnet's *Speech on the Sacheverell Case* (1710).

at that time hardly recognised out of Scotland, and it was peculiarly necessary for a people who in the competition of life were depressed by the weight of great natural disadvantages. It must be acknowledged, however, that a very large part of the credit of the movement in favour of education belongs to the Church which preceded the Reformation, nor is any fact in Scotch history more remarkable than the noble enthusiasm for knowledge which animated that Church during the fifteenth century. The establishment of the University of St. Andrews in 1410, of that of Glasgow in 1450, of that of Aberdeen in 1495, the formation of grammar schools in the burgh corporations, and, above all, that remarkable law enacted in 1496, by the Scotch Parliament, requiring all barons and freeholders of substance, under pain of a heavy fine, to send their eldest sons to grammar schools till they had obtained a competent knowledge of Latin, and then for three years to 'the schules of art and jure,' till they had acquired a sufficient knowledge of law to distribute justice among their people, abundantly attest the importance of the movement. Even the University of Edinburgh, though not formally established till 1582, was chiefly endowed by a sum bequeathed many years before for that purpose by Reid, the Catholic bishop of Orkney.¹ It was on these foundations that the statesmen of the Reformation and of the Revolution built, but it must be added that the Scotch Kirk uniformly exhibited a most praiseworthy zeal in extending the benefits of education. Knox himself, as early as 1560, had proposed an elaborate system of national education. Soon after the rebellion of 1640 the establishment throughout Scotland of parochial schools, imitated from those at Geneva, and placed under the direct supervision of

¹ Bower's *Hist. of the University of Edinburgh*, i. 69.

the Kirk, was decreed, and the clergy largely extended the system of bursarships which has played so conspicuous a part in Scotch life, and has brought the advantage of university education within the range of classes wholly excluded from it in England.¹ The singularly disputatious character of Scotch preaching, and the republican form of Scotch Church government, contributed to give a considerable though one-sided stimulus to the national mind. Burnet, describing his own experience when preaching with some brother divines in Scotland in 1670, said, 'We were indeed amazed to see a poor commonalty so capable to argue on points of government and on the bounds to be set to the power of princes in matters of religion. Upon all these topics they had texts of Scripture at hand, and were ready with their answers to anything that was said to them. This measure of knowledge was spread even among the meanest of them, their cottagers, and their servants.'²

The turbulence of the time, however, and the rapid fluctuations of politics prevented some of these measures from being fully carried out, and the system of parochial schools was not finally, generally, and efficaciously established till the Act of 1696. Its effects in a few years became visible. Though the material well-being of the people, even of the most prosperous parts of Scotland, was during the greater part of the eighteenth century considerably below the average standard in England, though the Scotch poor in the Lowlands remained rather conspicuously deficient in the graces and the courtesies of life, the level of intelligence among them was soon distinctly higher, the proportion of national faculties called into active exercise was distinctly greater, than in any other part of the Empire. The impulse which was created in primary education

¹ See Bower's *Hist. of the University of Edinburgh*, i. 198-204.

² *Hist. of his Own Times*, i. 293.

was soon followed by a corresponding improvement in higher culture. The zeal of the Scotch student became notorious, and in the Lowlands at least the standard of general knowledge among the gentry was perceptibly higher than in England.¹ In no other country did the philosophy of Newton at so early a period find a general acceptance. In 1692 it was noticed that Newton had already received numerous congratulatory letters on the 'Principia,' but 'especially from Scotland.' The new philosophy was taught by James Gregory at St. Andrews, and by David Gregory at Edinburgh, prior to 1691; and the latter professor, having in that year been removed to the astronomical chair at Oxford, appears to have been the first person who made it popular in the great English University.² In the philosophy of the eighteenth century the name of Hume is only second to that of Kant, and Glasgow University was the centre of a great reaction against the teaching of Locke, conducted successively by Hutcheson, Adam Smith, and Reid, at a time when the English Universities, with their enormous revenues, were sunk in lethargy and prejudice.³

¹ Burnet, after deploring the low level of instruction among the English gentry, adds: 'The Scotch, though less able to bear the expense of a learned education, are much more knowing; the reason of which is this: the Scotch, even of indifferent fortunes, send private tutors with their children both to schools and colleges; these look after the young gentlemen mornings and evenings and read over with them what they have learned, and so make them perfecter in it; they generally go abroad a year or two and see the world.'—

Hist. of his Own Times, ii. 648. Lockhart (who is a more partial witness) says: 'It is obvious that at this very time (which must chiefly proceed from this humour of travelling) the Scotch gentry do far exceed those of England, so that in the one you shall find all the accomplishments of well-bred gentlemen, and in your country English esquires all the barbarity imaginable.' — *Lockhart Papers*, i. 252.

² Baden Powell's *Hist. of Natural Philosophy*, pp. 347, 348.

³ As early as 1703 Leibnitz

The Act of Toleration of 1712, granting the Episcopal clergy liberty and protection in their worship and permission to administer baptism and perform marriages, though less important than the measures I have mentioned, was also of some real advantage to the country. The establishment of the Scotch Kirk had undoubtedly fulfilled the wishes of a majority of the people, but there were many districts, especially in the north of Scotland, where Episcopalianism had struck deep root, where the new Church was only accepted with much difficulty, and where a majority, or at least a large minority, long continued sincerely attached to the proscribed faith.¹ After undergoing great hardship and persecution in the years immediately following the Revolution, the Episcopal clergy obtained a small measure of legal toleration by the Comprehension Act of 1695, which, however, only applied formally to parish churches, leaving Episcopal

wrote to Lord Roxburgh: 'The Scotch prove clearly enough that their genius can quite keep pace with that of the English. Messrs. David Gregory and Creigh are taking successful pains with mathematics, but the late Mr. James Gregory especially was an excellent genius. I say nothing of the illustrious Lord Napier, the author of the *Logarithms*. I hope also that Mr. Cunningham . . . will do honour to his country whenever he shall choose to communicate to the public the great knowledge he possesses.'—Kemble's *State Papers*, pp. 319, 320.

¹ I think anyone who will read the evidence collected in the eighth chapter of Lawson's *Hist. of the Episcopalian Church in Scotland* will conclude that the

Episcopalian minority was more important, and the resistance to the establishment of Presbyterianism more serious, than would be inferred from the narrative of Macaulay. In one parish — that of Glenorchy — some of the parishioners actually marched the Presbyterian minister over the bounds of the parish (the piper meanwhile playing the march of death) and compelled him to swear that he would never return. — See Stewart's *Sketches of the Highlanders*, i. 105, 106, 138. See, too, on the number of Scotch Episcopalians, Lathbury's *Hist. of the Non-jurors*, pp. 420–422. The lower and middle classes were usually Presbyterian, the nobility and gentry Episcopalian.

worship in private houses and meeting-houses as illegal as before. All Episcopal clergymen who had not before been deprived, were permitted by this Act to retain their benefices on taking the oath of allegiance and subscribing the 'assurance' which was the Scotch equivalent to the abjuration oath. The great majority of the Episcopal clergy refused to comply with this latter condition, which, by asserting that the Pretender had no right to the throne, was tantamount to abandoning the doctrine of the Divine right of kings. A small number, however, known as the 'Protected Ministers,' submitted and were suffered to retain their benefices, but not to take any share in the government of the Church, and, though it was not expressly stated in the Act of Parliament, they were assumed by the law courts to be beyond the control of the Church Judicatures. This assumption was, it is true, violently contested by the Presbyterian authorities, and they made more than one effort to bring the Episcopalian clergy within the range of their discipline.¹ It is worthy of notice that the difference between the Churches for several years after the Revolution lay exclusively in the system of Church government, for the Episcopalians in Scotland employed no liturgy and conducted their worship in almost exactly the same way as the Presbyterians.

The bitterness, however, that raged between them was very great. The memory of atrocious persecutions inflicted on the Presbyterians during the period of Episcopalian ascendancy, and the fierce and acrid fanaticism of the Kirk, excited the people to the utmost, though in the great towns the Episcopal meeting-houses were usually connived at. Queen Anne, shortly after her accession, wrote a letter to the Privy Council, expressing her wish that the Episcopal clergy should be permitted

¹ See Lathbury's *Hist. of the Nonjurors*, pp. 438, 439.

the free exercise of public worship. As the Tory party acquired an ascendancy, the spirit of the Government became hostile to the Presbyterian establishment, and there were serious fears that an attempt would be made to subvert it. The Episcopalians, on the other hand, identified themselves more closely with the English Church, and after the Union some of them began to employ the Anglican liturgy in their services—an innovation which excited paroxysms of alarm and indignation in Scotland, partly on religious grounds, partly as a symptom of a very dangerous alliance of Churches. The matter was brought to an issue by a Scotch clergyman named Greenshields, who had for some time held a curacy in Ireland, but returned to Scotland in 1709, and, having taken the required oaths, opened an Episcopal meeting-house at Edinburgh, and made use of the English liturgy. A petition against it was at once presented to the General Assembly from many of the inhabitants of Edinburgh. The Assembly passed an Act proclaiming that the Union was infringed by ‘the use of set forms, rites, and ceremonies.’ The magistrates interfered, and threw Greenshields into prison. The ostensible reason was that he officiated in an unauthorised meeting-house. The real reason was that he employed the English liturgy in his worship. On an appeal to the Court of Session the sentence of the magistrates was confirmed; but Greenshields at once took a step which filled his opponents with dismay. He appealed to the British House of Lords, and the Presbyterians were made for the first time to feel that a question relating to their own discipline and jurisdiction could be decided by a tribunal consisting in part of English bishops. Harley and St. John wished the appeal to be withdrawn, as being certain to give bitter offence either in England or in Scotland, but Lockhart of Carnwath¹ and other Tory Scotch

¹ See Lockhart's *Memoirs*, i. 378.

members insisted on its being heard, and in March 1711 the House of Lords reversed the judgment of the Court of Session, and condemned the Edinburgh magistrates to costs.

This episode, occurring at a time when Presbyterian meeting-houses were perfectly legal in England, naturally caused much indignation south of the Tweed, and it was the immediate forerunner of the Toleration Act of 1712. It was, no doubt, true that this Act was supported by many who were enemies to the Scotch Establishment, and who hoped that a toleration would lead to its overthrow ; but this fact will not justify, and will but slightly palliate, the passionate, vehement, and persistent hatred with which the bare toleration of Episcopalians was denounced by the Presbyterians of Scotland. It was described as inconsistent with the existence and with the discipline of the Established Church, as a breach of the Union, as opening the door to great corruption both in doctrine and worship, as a grievous sin against the Almighty. A petition was addressed to the Queen adjuring her to interpose in order to prevent 'such a manifest and ruinous encroachment.' The pulpits rang with denunciations of toleration. The Assembly assumed an attitude of uncompromising hostility. Carstairs,¹ the ablest of the Scotch divines, was sent to London to oppose it, and Defoe, the most brilliant writer among the English Nonconformists, employed his pen in the same cause. The English Parliament, however, was at this time borne along on the full wave of Tory enthusiasm that followed the Sacheverell impeachment, and public

¹ The proceedings of Carstairs on this matter have been lately investigated with much learning and ability from the Scotch Kirk point of view, in Story's *Life of Carstairs*. See, too, the preface

to Defoe's *Hist. of the Union*, Burton's *Hist. of Scotland*, Lathbury's *Hist. of the Nonjurors*, and the tracts on the subject published at the time.

opinion was not a little stirred when it was known that even English regiments in Scotland were not suffered to have the English service publicly celebrated for their use.¹ The measure was carried, but a provision was added which at once diminished its benefit and added to its unpopularity. The Whigs, who could hardly, consistently with their principles, oppose a Toleration Act, desired at least that it should not shelter a Jacobite party, and carried a clause making the oath of abjuration indispensable for those who desired the benefits of the Act. The Tories accepted the clause, but extended the oath to the Established Church. It might appear at first sight that the Presbyterians at least, who entirely discarded the doctrine of the Divine right of kings, and who had in general very little sympathy with the Stuarts, would have found no difficulty in taking an oath abjuring the Pretender, and promising allegiance to the sovereign who reigned according to the Act of Settlement. It was discovered, however, by the keen eye of theological jealousy, that, as the Act of Settlement provided that the reigning sovereign must be a member of the Anglican Church, the oath imposed on the Presbyterians of Scotland was an act of homage and an additional guarantee to Prelacy. Some positively refused to take it, and seceded from the Establishment; others took it, making at the same time a formal declaration that they did so under the belief that it implied no deviation from their strict allegiance to the Presbyterian type of worship and Church government; and for many years the new test, as it was termed, added very materially to the discontent which the Toleration Act produced among the Presbyterians of Scotland. Among the Episcopalians its effects were still more serious. The clergy of this Church were almost universally Jacobite, and the conditions of the

¹ See Lathbury's *Hist. of the Nonjurors*, p. 451.

Toleration Act were that they should pray for the reigning sovereign, and take the oath not only of allegiance, but also of abjuration. These conditions they could not or would not accept. The oath, as I have already explained, involved a distinct repudiation of the religious doctrine of the Divine right of kings—a retrospective judgment which many, wholly free from the taint of disloyalty, were unable to make.¹ As a matter of fact, it was usually not taken, and the required prayer was not offered. On the rare occasions when, in Episcopalian meeting-houses, the King was prayed for, the congregation would rise up; men and women would begin to take snuff, or to occupy themselves in some other trivial way, and not a single response would be heard.² The Toleration Act, however, saved the Episcopalians from State prosecutions. The Government left them in tranquillity as long as they remained peaceful, and the partial recognition of the Episcopal Church, though it proved but temporary, had the effect of considerably extending the sphere of religious liberty, of checking in some degree the extreme despotism of the Kirk Sessions, and perhaps of preventing many Scotchmen from abandoning their country.

The next great object to be attained was the development of industrial life. We have seen how profoundly—it might easily have been imagined how incurably—the habits of the Scotch were opposed to those of an industrial community, and how one of the greatest Scotchmen of his time imagined that the only way of correcting them was by instituting a gigantic system of slavery. In truth, however, the slow but simple remedy for the evil was found in the legislative emancipation of Scotch industry. The first great impulse towards industrial life in Scotland was given by the project of the

¹ See the powerful statement of Bishop Russell to this effect in Lawson, p. 266.

² Burt's *Letters*, i. 212.

Darien colony, which stirred the nation to the very depths, and created hopes that were only too soon dashed to the ground. A terrible reaction followed. On the ruin of the scheme in which so much of the capital of Scotland was embarked, poverty and discouragement became more general than ever, and the jealous hostility which the English Government and people had shown to the enterprise supplied a new aliment to the old national animosity. The real development of Scotch industry dates from the Union of 1707. This measure was not, it is true, a popular one. The political absorption of a small into a larger nationality can very rarely be effected without irritating the most sensitive chords of national feeling. The sentiment of nationality is one of the strongest and most respectable by which human beings are actuated. No other has produced a greater amount of heroism and self-sacrifice, and no other, when it has been seriously outraged, leaves behind it such enduring and such dangerous discontent. The deep hostility between the English and the Scotch, their difference in religion, their great difference in wealth, and the large national debt of England, all contributed to aggravate the difficulty. The Treaty of Union, however, as it was finally carried, was drawn up with great skill, and with much consideration for the interests of the weaker nation. It provided that the land tax should be so arranged that when England contributed 2,000,000*l.*, Scotland should only contribute 48,000*l.*, or rather less than a fortieth part; that in consideration of the heavy English debt, by which the taxation of the whole island would be increased, an equivalent of about 400,000*l.* should be granted to Scotland and applied to the payment of her small debt of 160,000*l.*, to making good the losses incurred in assimilating her coinage to that of England, to the restitution of the money lost by the

Darien Company, and, if any surplus remained, to the encouragement of her manufactures, and also that she should enjoy an exemption of a few years from some temporary taxes. With these exceptions the taxation of the two countries was equalised, and the same duties of custom and excise, the same system of weights and measures, the same coinage, the same laws concerning public right, policy and civil government were extended through the whole island. It was provided also that the succession of the United Kingdom should remain to the Princess Sophia and the heirs of her body, being Protestants; that sixteen peers elected every Parliament by the whole body of Scotch peers, and forty-five commoners elected, two-thirds of them by the counties, and the remainder by the boroughs, should represent Scotland in the United Parliament;¹ and that the Episcopal Church should be for ever established in England and the Presbyterian Church in Scotland. The Sovereign was also restrained from creating any additional Scotch peers, and the hereditary jurisdictions and all the other privileges of the existing peers, except that of voting in Parliament, were guaranteed. But, above all, perfect free trade was established between England and Scotland, and all the markets of the English plantations were thrown open to Scotland as freely as to her neighbour.

The commercial clauses of the Union laid the foundation of the material prosperity of Scotland, and they alone reconciled the most intelligent Scotchmen to the partial sacrifice of their nationality. The country was, indeed, reduced to a condition of chronic famine, and the emancipation of Scotch trade had become a cardinal

¹ The mode of election for both peers and commoners was to be determined in the last session of

the Scotch Parliament, whose act on this point the Union treaty ratified by anticipation.

object of every patriot. The Union in itself was extremely unpopular, but the English clearly intimated that on no other condition would they grant Scotland a share in the commercial privileges of the Empire. One of the last public acts of William had been to urge the expediency of an Union ; and in 1702 formal negotiations were entered into and commissioners were appointed to negotiate a treaty between the nations, but English manufacturing jealousy defeated the attempt. In 1703, however, a new Scotch Parliament assembled, which soon brought matters to an issue. The great majority of the members were vehement Presbyterians, full of suspicions of the High Church tendencies of the Queen and of bitter resentment at the policy of England. They adjourned, till other business had been despatched, the Bills of supply ; they began by passing a declaratory Act securing the Presbyterian government in Scotland, and they even made it high treason to impugn, either by writing, speaking, or acting, any article of the Claim of Rights, which asserted the evil of Episcopacy and the necessity for a Presbyterian Establishment. A Bill for tolerating the Episcopalians was brought forward, but its promoters did not venture to press it. Turning then from religious to civil matters, the Parliament proceeded with a high hand to exhibit its independence of England. Though members of the British Empire, though they bore their part in the burdens and the dangers of British wars, the Scotch were excluded by their neighbours from all trade with the colonies ; and they now resolved to consult exclusively their own interests and dignity. An Act was passed declaring that after the death of the reigning Queen the Sovereign of Scotland should have no right of declaring war without the consent of the Parliament. Another and still more startling measure, called the Bill of Security, provided that on the death of the Queen without issue,

the Estates should meet to name a Protestant successor ; but that this should not be the same person who would succeed to the crown of England unless a treaty had been first made securing ‘ the honour and sovereignty of the Scotch crown and kingdom, the freedom, frequency, and power of parliaments, the religion, freedom, and trade of the nation from English or any foreign influence.’ It was at the same time made high treason to administer the coronation oath without parliamentary authority, and orders were given immediately to arm the nation.

These were bold measures, and they showed plainly that the spirit of the nation could no longer be trifled with. Scotland could not directly compel England to grant her free trade, but she could proclaim herself a separate kingdom, and by the assistance of France she might have maintained her position. The last days of the Parliament of 1703 were indeed extremely alarming. A Bill brought in by the Earl of Marchmont to secure the succession to the House of Hanover was met by an outburst of furious derision ; and the House refused even to allow any record of it to remain in their books. An attempt to bring in a Bill of Supply was treated with scarcely less scorn, and for nearly two hours the debate was rendered inaudible by fierce cries of ‘ Liberty ! ’ and ‘ No subsidy ! ’ The necessities of the Government were such that the ministers appear to have supported a strange measure, which was carried, to remove the restrictions upon the importation of French wine, at a time when war was raging between England and France. The duty raised from it was found absolutely necessary for the public service ; while, on the other hand, the Jacobites supported the Bill as opening easy communications with France. Menaces of coercion were freely used on both sides. The footguards were ordered to be in readiness ; the Duke of

Queensberry, who was the Queen's High Commissioner, would have been in imminent danger of his life but for the protection of the soldiers. 'The whole nation,' said an observer, 'was strangely inflamed;' and 'a national humour of being independent of England fermented strongly among all sorts of people without doors.' While the royal assent was reluctantly granted to the other Bills, it was refused to the Bill of Security; and as the Scotch Parliament was proceeding to discuss still more stringent measures, limiting the prerogative of future sovereigns, it was suddenly prorogued without having voted supplies, and the pay of the army and the charge of the Government were suffered to run to credit.¹

It was hoped that in the recess the angry feeling would subside; and, as a means of softening some of the leaders, Athol, who, though he was Lord Privy Seal, had been prominent in opposition, was made a Duke; Tarbet, who had been conspicuous on the same side, was raised to the Earldom of Cromarty; and several other dignities were conferred. The Order of the Thistle was at this time revived and bestowed on some powerful noblemen. Some changes were made in the administration; the Duke of Queensberry, who had been accused of getting up a false charge of Jacobitism against some conspicuous nobles, was removed from the position of High Commissioner, and replaced by the Marquis of Tweeddale; and the royal speech, in opening the Session of 1704, urged in the strongest terms the absolute necessity of at once settling the question of the succession. But it soon appeared that the Parliament was neither conciliated nor dismayed. The Duke of Hamilton began the oppo-

¹ See on these and the subsequent transactions, *Lockhart Papers*, vol. i.; Tindal, *Hist. of*

England; Burnet's *Own Times*; Boyer's *Queen Anne*; Defoe's *Hist. of the Union*.

sition by moving that 'this Parliament could not proceed to name a successor to the crown until the Scots had a previous treaty with England in relation to commerce and other concerns.' The Bill of Security was again passed, with little modification, and this time it was tacked to a Bill for the payment of the army. The leading politicians openly declared their determination to refuse to vote funds for the payment of the troops till the Bill was passed. War was at this time raging; an invasion might at any time be expected; there was a strong Jacobite party in the Scotch Parliament; another party, guided by Fletcher of Saltoun, was almost or altogether republican, and desired to reduce the prerogative of the Crown to little more than a shadow, and make Scotland virtually independent of England. The resentment of the people at English commercial jealousy blazed fierce and high, and manifested itself by alarming demonstrations. If the royal assent was refused, an invading army from France might be altogether unresisted, and might even find the Parliament and people on its side. Under these very critical circumstances the English Government thought it prudent to yield, and by the advice of Godolphin the royal assent was given to the Bill of Security.

This step was vehemently unpopular in England. It was, in fact, nothing less than an agreement by the English ministry that unless certain privileges, to which the English Parliament and the English nation tenaciously clung, were accorded to the Scotch, the union of crowns effected under James I. should be annulled, and the nations, on the death of the reigning sovereign, should be definitely separated. Wharton is reported to have said, when the assent was given, that the head of the Lord Treasurer was now safe in the bag; and had not the battle of Blenheim just given a new strength to the ministry, it is not impossible that the

judgment might have proved true. When the English Parliament met, a vote of censure was at once moved against the Government. In order, probably, to moderate the language of the Opposition speakers, the Queen herself was present at the debate. The influence of Marlborough was exerted in favour of Godolphin, and his friends succeeded in defeating the motion. But whatever fate might await the ministry, it was plain that if the disruption of the kingdom was to be averted free trade must be conceded; and the English were resolved that it should be conceded only as the price of an Union. Seldom, however, was there less real union of feeling between the nations than at this time. Resolutions were passed by the House of Lords praying the Queen to fortify Newcastle, Tynemouth, Carlisle, and Hull; to call out the militia in the four northern counties; and to send a sufficient number of troops to the border. She was at the same time empowered to appoint commissioners on the part of England to negotiate an Union on condition that a similar step was taken by the Scotch Parliament; but if no such Union took place, and if the same succession to the crown with that of England were not enacted by a specified day, it was provided that all Scotchmen, except those who were settled residents in England or who were serving in her Majesty's forces, should be held as aliens; that the introduction of Scotch cattle, coal, and linen into England and of English horses or arms into Scotland should be absolutely forbidden; and that all Scotch vessels found trading with France should be captured.

The effects of the prohibitory clauses of this Bill on the feeble resources of Scotland would have been fatal, and from this time the Union was inevitable. The Scotch Parliament, however, met in June 1705 in a very angry mood. The ministry, being thought unable to meet the difficulties of the Bill, was changed. The Duke of

Argyle was appointed commissioner. The Duke of Queensberry again came to the front, in the office of Privy Seal, and some of the adherents of the ejected ministry, forming a separate party, added considerably to the complexity of the situation. Purely personal and factious motives played a great part in the events that ensued, and it is not here necessary to pursue them in detail. It is sufficient to say that the Duke of Hamilton was partially gained over by the administration, and that his defection in a great degree determined the course of events. Bills were passed providing that on the Queen's death the officers of State and Judges of the Supreme Court should be elected by Parliament, that a Scotch ambassador should be present at every treaty made by the Sovereign of the two kingdoms with a foreign Power, and that the Scotch Parliament should become triennial. None of these Bills received the royal assent, and the Scotch Parliament soon entered into the treaty for Union. A resolution of capital importance, moved, to the astonishment of most men, by the Duke of Hamilton, and carried by the absence of some of the usual opponents of the Government, placed the appointment of the Scotch commissioners for negotiating the Union in the hands of the Crown. As a preliminary step to the treaty it was insisted, as a matter affecting the national honour, that the English Act declaring the Scotch to be aliens should be repealed. This measure had answered its purpose of compelling the Scotch to negotiate, and the English Parliament wisely and gracefully consented to repeal it, as well as the clauses in the same Act relating to trade, and thus removed a formidable obstacle to the treaty. The Scotch would, if possible, have desired free trade without any other change in the constitution; and when it was plain that England would not submit to this, they would gladly have negotiated a federal union, but

the English statesmen steadily refused to grant the boon unless it were accompanied by a complete consolidation of the kingdom.

Somers, who possessed the qualities of a great statesman in a much higher degree than any other Englishman of the period of the Revolution, took a leading part in the negotiation, and he conducted it with consummate skill. Neither of the contracting parties entered into it with any enthusiasm, but each of them gained by the treaty an end of the utmost importance. England, at the expense of commercial concessions, at which her manufacturers were deeply indignant, obtained a strength in every contest with her enemies such as she had never before enjoyed. Scotland, at the price of the partial sacrifice of a nationality to which she was most passionately and most legitimately attached, acquired the possibility of industrial life, and raised her people from a condition of the most abject wretchedness. In the ten years preceding the Union the commercial intercourse between the two countries had been so slight that the goods imported from Scotland to England only twice exceeded the small amount of 100,000*l.*, and the imports from England into Scotland never in a single year exceeded 87,536*l.*, while the whole shipping trade of the smaller country was annihilated by the Navigation Act. But immediately after the Union the movement of industry and commerce was felt in every part of the Lowlands.¹ Glasgow, having no port or vessels of its own, chartered ships from Whitehaven and began a large trade with the American colonies.² In 1716 or 1718 the first Scotch vessel that ever crossed the Atlantic was launched upon the Clyde;³ in 1735 Glasgow possessed

¹ Craik's *Hist. of Commerce*, ii. 183, 184.

² Chambers' *Domestic Annals*, iii. 481.

³ Compare Buckle's *Hist. of Civilisation*, ii. 315; Burton's *Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 393

sixty-seven vessels with a tonnage of 5,600,¹ and in a few years she had become, in the American trade, a serious rival to the great seaports of England. It was in the first half of the eighteenth century that Greenock laid the foundation of its future greatness by the construction of a commodious harbour, and Paisley rose from a small village into a considerable manufacturing town.² It was computed that the aggregate tonnage of Scotch vessels rose between 1735 and 1760 from 12,342 tons to more than 52,000,³ and it was noticed as a significant evidence of the growth of the industrial spirit in Scotland, that from the time of the Union it was common for the younger sons of the gentry to become merchants, and to make voyages in that capacity to the Continent.⁴ In the seventeenth century almost the only Scotch manufacture had been that of linen. In imitation of the curious law which encouraged the English woollen trade by providing that every corpse should be buried in wool, a Scotch law of 1686 had enacted that every shroud should be of linen,⁵ but it was not until the Union gave the linen manufacture a wider vent, that the trade began really to flourish. It was introduced into Glasgow in 1725, it speedily spread through many other Scotch towns,⁶ and we find it appearing

¹ Burton's *Hist.* ii. 393.

² Buckle's *Hist. of Civilisation*, ii. 313-316.

³ Burton's *Hist.* ii. 393. Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 340.

⁴ Mrs. Mure's 'Remarks on the Change of Manners in my Time.'—*Caldwell Papers*, i. 266.

⁵ Chambers' *Annals*, iii. 85. Mrs. Mure, in her very curious sketch of the manners of her time, tells us that 'every woman made her web of wove linen and bleched it herself. It never rose

higher than 2s. the yard, and with this cloth was everybody clothed. The young gentlemen, who at this time [1727] were growing more delicat, got their cloth from Holland for shirts, but the old was satisfied with necks and sleeves of the fine, which was put on loose, above the country cloth.'—*Caldwell Papers*, i. 260. In the Highlands it was the first task of a newly married woman to prepare her winding-sheet.

⁶ See many curious facts on

even in the Orkney Islands about 1747.¹ It was noticed by the historian of commerce that on October 23, 1738, no less than 151,219 yards of Scotch linen, as well as 3,000 spindles of linen yarn, were imported into London, and that of late years the entries had been annually increasing.² The value of the Scotch linen stamped for sale in five years from 1728 to 1732 was 662,938*l*. In the four years from 1748 to 1751 it had risen to 1,344,814*l*.³ The Aberdeen trade in woollen stockings largely increased, and a considerable manufacture of coarse woollen serge grew up. Some time before the century had closed, cheap Scotch carpets had penetrated to most English houses.⁴ The preparation of kelp, which was introduced into Scotland in 1720, gave some industry to the poorest coasts;⁵ and the first Scotch county banks were established in 1749 at Aberdeen and Glasgow.⁶ The extreme poverty of Scotland was in this manner relieved, and with the extension of commerce the sober habits of industrial life began to pervade and reform the vagabond portion of the population.

It is hardly possible to advert to the Scotch Union without pausing for a moment to examine why its influence on the loyalty of the people should have ultimately been so much happier than that of the legislative union which, nearly a century later, was enacted between England and Ireland. A very slight attention to the circumstances of the case will explain the mystery, and will at the same time show the shallowness of those theorists who can only account for it by reference to

this subject in Buckle's *Hist. of Civilisation*, ii. 315-320.

¹ Barry's *Hist. of the Orkney Islands*, p. 368.

² Macpherson's *Annals of Commerce*, iii. 217.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 289.

⁴ Topham's *Letters from Edinburgh*, pp. 175, 176.

⁵ Barry's *Hist. of the Orkney Islands*, p. 376.

⁶ Buckle, ii. 320.

original peculiarities of national character. The sacrifice of a nationality is a measure which naturally produces such intense and such enduring discontent that it never should be exacted unless it can be accompanied by some political or material advantages to the lesser country that are so great and at the same time so evident as to prove a corrective. Such a corrective in the case of Scotland was furnished by the commercial clauses. The Scotch Parliament was very arbitrary and corrupt, and by no means a faithful representation of the people. The majority of the nation were certainly opposed to the Union, and, directly or indirectly, it is probable that much corruption was employed to effect it; but still the fact remains that by it one of the most ardent wishes of all Scottish patriots was attained, that there had been for many years a powerful and intelligent minority who were prepared to purchase commercial freedom even at the expense of the fusion of legislatures, and that in consequence of the establishment of free trade the next generation of Scotchmen witnessed an increase of material well-being that was utterly unprecedented in the history of their country. Nothing equivalent took place in Ireland. The gradual abolition of duties between England and Ireland was, no doubt, an advantage to the lesser country, but the whole trade to America and the other English colonies had been thrown open to Irishmen between 1775 and 1779. Irish commerce had taken this direction; the years between 1779 and the rebellion of 1798 were probably the most prosperous in Irish history, and the generation that followed the Union was one of the most miserable. The sacrifice of nationality was extorted by gross corruption. It was demanded by no considerable section of the Irish people. It was accompanied by no signal political or material benefit that could mitigate or counteract its unpopularity, and it was effected without a

dissolution, in opposition to the votes of the majority of the representatives of the counties and considerable towns, and to numerous addresses from every part of the country. Can any impartial man be surprised that such a measure, carried in such a manner, should have proved unsuccessful? There was, it is true, one course that might have made it palatable. The Irish never dreamed of demanding the establishment of the Church of the majority, which in the case of Scotland was solemnly guaranteed by the Union. They never dreamed of demanding even that religious equality which, sixty-eight years after the Union, was at last conceded. The Union Treaty, indeed, had a special clause guaranteeing the perpetuity of the established Church of the minority, and it was one of the favourite arguments of Castlereagh that it would stereotype the inequality. But there were other and less ambitious ends which the majority of the Irish people desired. Had the Catholic population been able to look back to the Union as the era of their complete political emancipation, of the settlement of the tithe question, and of the payment of the priests, the whole current of Irish feeling might have been changed. The propriety of uniting these measures with the Union was self-evident, and Pitt naturally perceived it; but the actual proceedings of his Government on the subject were such that it would have been better had the question of emancipation never been raised. The shameful story will be hereafter told. It is sufficient here to say that the Government intimated to the leading Catholics that they would be in favour of emancipation and of the other two measures I have mentioned if the Union were carried, and that they succeeded in this manner in obtaining some valuable ecclesiastical support, and in inducing the great body of the Catholics to remain passive during the struggle. But no sooner had the Union been accom-

plished than it appeared that the ministers were not even agreed in desiring emancipation, that they had not taken a single step to overcome the known opposition of the King, and that they were prepared to make no considerable sacrifice in favour of the Catholics. Pitt resigned office, indeed, when the King refused to consent to the measure, but a month had not passed before he himself agreed to abandon it, and when he resumed power it was on the express understanding that he would oppose any attempt to carry emancipation. Nor was any attempt made to carry the commutation of tithes and the payment of the priests. The Catholics for some years acted with perfect moderation, till it became evident to all men that their cause had not only not been assisted, but had even been greatly impeded by the Union. Then at last O'Connell induced them to change their policy. He succeeded in carrying them into a violent agitation, which brought the country to the verge of civil war, and he obtained emancipation from a Tory ministry by the menace of rebellion. Such events were not likely to pacify the country, or to reconcile it to the sacrifice of its nationality; and it is not surprising that the organised agitation that was created should have been turned in the direction of repeal, or that the animosity produced by the Union should even now be far from extinguished.

In all this there is nothing mysterious. It is obvious that the Union never ought to have been carried until some considerable section of the people desired it, and until it could be accompanied by serious measures for improving the position of the Catholics and for attaching their priesthood to the Government. A nation, however, which has never been called upon to surrender its nationality is apt to underrate the difficulty of the sacrifice in others; and public writers, in whom this sentiment has usually been enfeebled by education

or other causes, hardly recognise sufficiently its great power over large masses of men. But certainly the history of the Scotch Union, if rightly understood, should not lead men into this error, for it is most instructive to observe how tenacious and how violent was the hostility to the measure for many years after its material benefits had become apparent.¹ Many influences concurred in aggravating the discontent. To anyone who will attentively study the subject, it will appear evident that the religious difficulty in Scotland in the beginning of the eighteenth century was even more serious than the religious difficulty in Ireland at its close. One section of the Scotch clergy had long denounced as sinful all allegiance to a sovereign who was connected with Episcopacy, and when the project of Union was announced it was met by a storm of religious invective. To enter into an adulterous union with a nation which had adopted the anti-Christian system of prelacy, to acknowledge the legislative and judicial authority of an assembly in which bishops sat, to recognise in innumerable public documents their titles as lords over God's heritage, to throw in the lot of Scotland with that of a nation which had so long persecuted the saints, was denounced as a complete apostasy from the true religion of the Covenant. Such a measure, it was said, was essentially and grossly sinful, and could not fail to entail upon the purer nation the divine wrath accumulated by the crimes of the oppressor. More moderate divines questioned whether any mere treaty provision could secure the establishment of Presbyterianism if the supreme legislative power were lodged with a Parliament consisting mainly of Episcopalians, and their apprehensions derived much weight

¹ This is noticed by all Scotch historians, but the course of opinion has lately been traced

with especial fullness by Mr. Burton in his valuable History.

from the fact that, soon after the Union, a Tory ministry, supported by a furious outburst of Church feeling, was in power. The Act securing the toleration of Episcopacy, the imposition of the abjuration oath on Presbyterians, the partial restoration by the Imperial Parliament of that lay patronage which had been abolished by the Revolution, and the legal recognition of Christmas, were all esteemed great grievances by the Kirk.

There were also many others of a different kind. Edinburgh suffered from the withdrawal of the Parliament. Taxation was increased; the trade with France was stopped; the retail trade of Scotland was disturbed by the sudden influx of English goods; the commissioners of customs and excise appointed for carrying out the Union were chiefly Englishmen. The Scotch Privy Council was abolished in 1708 in defiance of the wishes of the great majority of the Scotch representatives. When the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended in the same year on account of the Jacobite expedition, the Government availed themselves of their power to arrest many of their leading opponents, including Lord Belhaven and Fletcher of Saltoun, who were certainly not Jacobites, and who were actually carried, under custody, to London. It was very difficult to obtain convictions for treason in Scotland, and accordingly a Bill was framed in 1709 making the law in cases of treason the same throughout the whole kingdom; it was carried, in spite of the strenuous and almost unanimous opposition of the Scotch, in both Houses, and under its provisions eighty-nine Scotch rebels were carried in 1716 from Edinburgh to Carlisle to be tried by English juries. The House of Lords, too, exhibited an extreme and illiberal jealousy of the Scotch peers, and in 1711, when the English dukedom of Brandon was conferred on the Duke of Hamilton, the Whig majority, including Somers and Cowper, in order to limit strictly the num-

ber of Scotchmen in the House, passed a resolution declaring that, although the Sovereign had an undoubted right to confer English peerages on Scotch peers, these peerages did not carry with them the right of sitting or voting in the House of Lords, or of taking part in the trial of peers. This decision was dictated mainly by party and national feeling. It was all the more scandalous, because at this very time the Duke of Queensberry was sitting in the House by virtue of an English peerage bestowed on him since the Union, and it was not rescinded until the unanimous opinion of the judges was given against its legality, in 1782. In 1713 a new and terrible grievance arose when the malt tax, which was one of the heaviest of English burdens, was extended to Scotland, where the poverty of the nation, and the poor quality of the native barley, made it almost insupportable.¹

All these things, together with the constant insults to which the Scotch were exposed in London on account of their poverty, their pronunciation, or their birth, envenomed the minds of a proud people, who had but just consented to a most painful sacrifice of their nationality. The unpopularity of the Union, at the time it was carried, was abundantly shown by the addresses which poured in from every side against it, and by the fierce demonstrations in every leading city in Scotland.² In 1708 the violent discontent produced by it was one of the chief reasons that induced Lewis XIV. to attempt a Jacobite invasion.³

¹ It was contended, with some reason, that this imposition was a violation of the Union. The 14th article provided that Scotland should not be subject to any malt tax during the war; and at the time when it was imposed, though peace had been signed with France, it had not yet been

signed with Spain.

² Much striking evidence of this, as well as of the long continuance of the discontent, will be found in the *Lockhart Papers*.

³ *Lockhart Papers*, i. 224-227. Boyer's *Hist. of Queen Anne*, pp. 334, 335.

In 1713, when the malt tax was first extended to Scotland, the Scotch peers, and among them the Duke of Argyle, who had taken a leading part in carrying the Union, brought forward in the House of Lords a motion for its repeal, and they were only defeated by a majority of four. In 1715 the deep dissatisfaction produced by the Union was a leading element of the Jacobite rebellion. In 1725 an attempt to levy the malt tax in Scotland produced in Edinburgh and Glasgow riots almost amounting to insurrection, and, but for the presence of a strong military force, the whole country would have been in a flame.¹ In 1745, when the Pretender endeavoured to rally the nation around his standard, the most seductive offer he could make was a promise that he would restore the old Parliament of Scotland. How much longer the discontent smouldered on, it is impossible to say. There was then no such thing as popular suffrage or vote by ballot, and we can

¹ At this time Lockhart wrote to the Pretender: 'As the aversion to the Union daylie increases, that is the handle by which Scotsmen will be incited to make a generall and zealous appearance: this your enimies know so well that on former occasions all manner of pains were taken to buz in the people's ears that they'd be disappointed in what they expected from you, for that to gratify your subjects of England you was to uphold the Union.' Lockhart accordingly recommends, as the most efficacious way of raising Scotland, a proclamation promising repeal.—*Lockhart Papers*, ii. 224-236. See, too, the passages I have quoted, i. 164. A very touching letter of advice, written on his deathbed by the ninth Earl

of Eglinton, in 1729, for the guidance of his infant son when he grew older, contains the following passage: 'You come to live in a time, my chiefest care, when the right of these kingdoms comes to be a question betwixt the House of Hanover, who are in possession, and the descendants of King James. You are in my poor opinion not to intermeddle with either but live abstractedly at home . . . for since we are under the misery and slavery of being united to England, a Scotsman without prostituting his honour can obtain nothing by following a court, but bring his estates under debt, and consequently himself to necessity.'—*Fraser's Memorials of the Earls of Eglinton*, i. 116.

only glean from incidental notices the real sentiments of the people. It is impossible, however, not to be struck by the bitterness with which the Union was regarded, long after the rebellion of 1745, by such a Scotchman as Smollett, and at a still later period by such a Scotchman as Sir Walter Scott.

The industrial life, however, which it rendered possible was one of the most important elements in the regeneration of Scotland. The work was completed by another group of measures reducing the Highlands to a condition of comparative civilisation. One serious obstacle to be encountered was the language, for there were great tracts in which the English tongue was unknown. The parochial schools were intended, among other objects, to spread the knowledge of English, and 'to root out the Irish language,'¹ and the same ends were very powerfully forwarded by a Scotch 'Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge,' which obtained letters patent from Anne in 1709, and was chiefly designed to dispel the ignorance of the Highlands. It established numerous schools in the mountain districts; and a very competent historian, writing in 1775, stated that, as a consequence of its efforts, public worship had in many places ceased to be celebrated in Gaelic, that Popery had considerably diminished, and that the English language was 'so diffused, that in the remotest glens it is spoken by the young people.'² The zeal in spreading the English language was, indeed, carried to such an extent that there were even those who objected to the diffusion of the Bible in the Highland tongue.³

¹ See the appendix to Burt's *Letters*, ii. 363.

² Lachlan Shaw's *Hist. of Moray*, p. 381. In 1730, Primate Boulter notices 'the good success of the corporation established in Scotland for the instruction of

the ignorant and barbarous part of that nation,' and the example contributed largely to the institution of the Irish Charter Schools. Boulter's *Letters*, ii. 10-13.

³ 'Their language is attacked

Another great difficulty was the want of communications. As long as there were no roads through the Highlands it was impossible to restrain the influence of the chiefs, or to assert the authority of the law; and regular soldiers were almost powerless when matched against lightly clad and hardened mountaineers, who knew every glen and mountain pass. After the rebellion of 1715 an Act was passed for disarming the Highlanders, and many barracks were built; but these measures proved utterly useless. The loyal clans alone brought in their arms. The soldiers were easily baffled and bewildered in the trackless mountains. They were ignorant of the language; they could obtain no information from the inhabitants, and their presence tended rather to weaken than to strengthen the law, for it was a standing proof of the impotence of the Government.¹ About 1726 Marshal Wade undertook to make the Disarming Act a reality, and at the same time to strike a death-blow to the power of the chiefs by opening up the Highlands. Surveyors and engineers were brought from England, one of them being that Captain Burt whom I have so often quoted. Troops were employed on extra pay to make the roads, and after about eleven years of patient labour, the greater part of the Highlands was made thoroughly accessible. The place which this enterprise occupies in history is not a great one, but very few measures have contributed so largely to the moral, material, and political civilisation of Scotland.²

on every side. Schools are erected in which English alone is taught, and there were lately some who thought it reasonable to refuse them a version of the Holy Scriptures, that they might have no monument of their native tongue.'—Johnson's *Tour in the Hebrides*, p. 85. See, too, p. 159.

¹ See 'Lord Lovat's Memoir to George I. on the State of the Highlands' (1724), in the appendix to Burt's *Letters*.

² See the Memoir on Scotch Roads, appended to Burt's *Letters*, and numerous notices of their history in Chambers' *Domestic Annals of Scotland*. It was on the road between Inver-

The extension of education, the formation of a powerful middle class in consequence of the industrial development of the Lowlands, the Disarming Act, and, above all, the new roads that intersected the Highlands, gradually destroyed the absolute power which the chiefs exercised over their clans, brought them within the range of the law, and weakened that moral sentiment which lay at the root of their power. The Union contributed very powerfully to the same end; the political weight of the great majority of the Scotch nobles was destroyed; the sixteen representative peers legislated in England; London became the centre of their hopes, their ambitions, and their intrigues, and the bond of sympathy that had so closely united them to their people was slowly dissolved. The rebellions of 1715 and 1745 ruined many of the great Scotch families; some noblemen were executed, the property of others was confiscated, several were compelled to take refuge on the Continent and lived for a whole generation away from their clans. In this manner the moral condition of the Highlands was profoundly modified, and the way was prepared for the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions by the Pelham Ministry in 1746. This great measure was the natural consequence of the suppression of the rebellion; and although these jurisdictions had been guaranteed by the Union, their abolition was of such manifest advantage to the nation, and was so clearly inevitable through the causes I have enumerated, that it was carried with little difficulty. A compensation of about 150,000*l.* reconciled the gentry to the destruction of the last vestige of feudal power, and the hopeless ruin of the Jacobite cause put an end to all expectation of its revival.

ness and Inverary that the obelisk stood with the well-known inscription—

Had you seen these roads before they
were made,
You would lift up your hands and bless
General Wade.

Other measures, of much more doubtful benefit, were carried about the same time. Not content with again disarming the Highlanders, the Legislature passed an Act rendering it penal for them to wear their national dress; and by doing so it produced a deep and general irritation. A somewhat inquisitorial measure compelled all private teachers to take the oath of allegiance; and the Scotch Episcopal Church, which was still vehemently Jacobite, was crushed by laws of terrible severity. We have already seen how, by the Toleration Act of 1712, the oaths, both of allegiance and abjuration, and the obligation of praying by name for the Sovereign, were imposed on all officiating clergymen; how this obligation was generally neglected; and how the Government usually connived at the neglect. In 1718, however, during an alarm about the Pretender, a severe law was enacted rendering all Episcopal clergymen who performed divine worship without having taken the prescribed oaths liable to six months' imprisonment; and every religious assembly of nine or more persons, exclusive of the household, was declared to be a meeting-house within the meaning of the Act.¹ The law was but little enforced. For many years after the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty, the Pretender seems to have habitually designated the clergyman who was to fill a vacancy in the Scotch episcopacy.² The whole of that episcopacy, as well as the great majority of the minor clergy, remained Nonjurors; and in each rebellion the

¹ 5 George I. c. 29.

² See the *Lockhart Papers*, vol. ii. *passim*, but especially pp. 76-93, 104-108, 116, 117. A serious schism, however, broke out among the bishops of the Scotch Church in 1726, which caused much trouble to the Jacobites. A Bishop of Edinburgh

appears from Lockhart to have been one of the most active of the Jacobites under George I., and his son was one of the Jacobite prisoners taken in the Rebellion of 1715.—Bishop Nicholson's *Letters* (British Museum Add. MSS. 6116, p. 70).

Church was strongly on the side of the Pretender. The result was the crushing Act of 1746. It was enacted that every person who exercised the functions of pastor or minister in any Episcopal meeting-house in Scotland without registering his letters of orders, taking the prescribed oaths, and praying by name for the Sovereign, should, on conviction, be imprisoned for six months for the first offence, transported for life to some of his Majesty's colonies for the second, and imprisoned for life if he returned; and any place where more than four persons besides the household assembled for public worship, was constituted a meeting-house under the provisions of the Act. The penalties were no longer confined to clergymen; every layman present at one of these illegal meetings who did not give information to the magistrate within five days, was liable to a fine of 5*l.* on the first conviction and to two years' imprisonment on the second. No one convicted of having been twice in one year at an illegal Episcopal meeting-house could sit in either House of Parliament, could vote for a representative peer or for a Member of the House of Commons, could act as magistrate or councillor, or could hold, for one year after conviction, any civil or military office in Scotland; and all judges and magistrates convicted of negligence in putting the Act into force were liable to a fine of 50*l.*¹ Nor was this all. A supplementary Act provided that no clergyman, even if he had complied with all the provisions of the law, could officiate in Scotland unless he could produce letters of orders from a bishop of the Church of England or of Ireland.² As the Scotch bishops were, without exception, Nonjurors, their letters of orders were insufficient, and as it was impossible for Orders to be repeated, the effect of this law was to unfrock all the

¹ 19 George II. c. 38.

² 21 George II. c. 34.

existing Episcopal clergy in Scotland, except the few who had been ordained out of the country. The clause was vehemently opposed by the English bishops, who dilated upon the disrespect shown to Episcopal orders, and, with more justice, upon the extreme hardship of depriving a large body of men—many of them guilty of no offence whatever—of their means of livelihood, and shutting against them every door of repentance. For a time the opposition was successful, and the clause was thrown out in committee; but by the strenuous efforts of Lord Hardwicke it was speedily restored.

These measures were certainly not unprovoked, but they were examples, I think, of a very excessive and injudicious severity; and they reduced one section of the Scotch people to a state of great suffering and depression, from which they were not relieved till the following reign. They did not, however, affect a sufficiently large proportion of the people to counteract the long train of favourable influences that were operating in Scotland, and the pacification of the Highlands rapidly advanced. The elder Pitt, by forming the Highlanders into Scotch regiments in the great war against France, gave a full vent and a new direction to their military qualities, created among them a new enthusiasm, and enabled them speedily to efface, by new and glorious deeds, the bitter recollections of the past.

The industrial habits that had taken such deep root in Scotland speedily penetrated to the relations between landlord and tenant, and the effects were by no means entirely good. A very painful transition took place from a state of society that rested upon feudal custom to a state of society that was governed by mercantile principles. Rack rents had, it is true, been known at a much earlier period,¹ but they do not appear to have

¹ Fletcher of Saltoun wrote in 1698: 'Were I to assign the principal and original source of our poverty, I should place it in the

been general during the first forty years of the eighteenth century ; or, at least, they were not usually paid to the landlord. The system of middle-men, or, as they were termed, tacksmen, or feuars, became almost universal ;¹ and it produced all those evils which were so well known in Ireland before the famine. The head tenant held his farm at a very low rent from the landlord ; he sublet it at a heavier rent, and subdivided it to such an extent that farms which one family and four horses would suffice to cultivate had from four to sixteen families living upon them.² In consequence of the clan system tenants were never displaced and rarely migrated, and they multiplied indefinitely on the same spot. Rents were settled by custom ; feudal duties were largely considered, and the landlord cared more for maintaining around him skilful robbers and bold soldiers than for increasing his revenue or improving his estate.

Such a system was very rude and barbarous, but it was impossible to overthrow it without inflicting much distress. Very soon after the rebellion of 1745 it was completely destroyed. Some estates were confiscated, many old proprietors were ruined or driven

letting of our lands at so excessive a rate as makes the tenant poorer even than his servant, whose wages he cannot pay . . . and makes the master have a troublesome and ill-paid rent ; his land not improved by enclosure or otherwise, but for want of horses and oxen fit for labour everywhere run out and abused.'—*Second Discourse on the Affairs of Scotland*.

¹ Ramsay, writing in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, says : 'The hardest masters were the lesser feuars, who being themselves countrymen

knew the full value of the land, and had not the smallest scruple at racking their dependants. It has often been observed that there is no oppressor so unfeeling as a *bonnet laird*, or a tenant who has power to sublet. But for many years back there has been a clause in most of our tacks prohibiting subletting.'—*Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 190.

² See the 'Inquiry into the Causes of Rebellions in the Highlands,' append. to Burt's *Letters*, ii. 340, 341.

into exile ; new men with new methods of management were in the ascendant, and the great social and political changes that followed the abolition of the hereditary jurisdictions were intensified by a great and sudden rise in the price of cattle, which profoundly altered the conditions of Scotch agriculture. Pennant, who visited Scotland in 1769, and Dr. Johnson, who visited it in 1773, have both left us vivid descriptions of the social and economic change that was at that time taking place. Rents of competition were everywhere replacing rents of custom. The landlord, being no longer a feudal chief, sought to increase his revenue by raising rents ; the tenants resisted, and were ejected without scruple, and new tenants came in who, regarding the whole transaction in a commercial spirit, were entirely without feudal attachment to their landlord. The old hospitality exercised by the chief had ceased ; his army of retainers disappeared ; the clans were rapidly dispersing, some seeking to improve their lot in the great industrial cities of the Lowlands, and very many emigrating to America. In remote districts, where the spirit of enterprise had not penetrated, the change produced extreme distress ; the tenants clinging desperately to their old farms, though their complete want of agricultural skill made it impossible for them to pay with tolerable comfort the increased rents. The whole character of the people was rapidly changing, and the chief, who had once been looked upon as the father of his people, was too often regarded only as a rapacious landlord.¹

There was much in this change that it is impossible to contemplate without regret, but the general result

¹ See the very interesting description—unfortunately too long for quotation—of this change in Johnson's *Tour*, pp. 144–152.

Pennant's *Tour* (Pinkerton, iii. 95, 328, 329). Ramsay's *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 505–517.

was on the whole beneficial. The deplorable agriculture which had so long contributed to impoverish Scotland began to give way before the stimulus of competition, and the economical condition of the Highlands was rapidly ameliorated. Some efforts to improve the agriculture or the breeds of cattle in Scotland had been made, about the time of the Union, by the Earl of Haddington, by Sir Archibald Grant, by Lockhart of Carnwath, and by Elizabeth Mordaunt—the daughter of Lord Peterborough and the wife of the eldest son of the Duke of Gordon.¹ Large tracts were about the same time planted, the seats of the nobility were embellished,² and a society ‘for improving the knowledge of agriculture’ was founded at Edinburgh in 1723;³ but it was not until after the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions that Scotch agriculture began to show any real promise of the admirable perfection it has since attained.⁴ If feudal virtues and some of the more romantic aspects of Highland life had diminished, the loss was more than compensated by the immense increase of order, sobriety, honesty, and security. The manners of all classes were softening. It is remarkable that the use of tea, which only became common among the upper classes in England late in the seventeenth century, had some time before the middle of the eighteenth century become general among the very poorest classes in the Lowlands, and was to a great extent superseding among them the use of intoxicating drinks.⁵ The progress of the High-

¹ Chambers’ *Domestic Annals of Scotland*, iii. 417–419.

² Macky’s *Tour in Scotland* (1723), p. 276.

³ Chambers’ *Annals*, iii. 484.

⁴ Burton’s *Hist.* ii. 393, 394.

⁵ In a very valuable paper on ‘The State of the Revenue of Scotland,’ drawn up about 1742,

Duncan Forbes laments bitterly the decline of the duty on beer and ale arising from this cause. ‘The cause of the mischief we complain of,’ he says, ‘is evidently the excessive use of tea, which is now become so common that the meanest families, even of labouring people, particularly

lands was even more startling than that of the Lowlands. Travellers said with truth that there was no recorded instance in Europe of so rapid and so extraordinary an improvement as took place in them in the thirty or forty years that followed the rebellion. In that time districts which had been for centuries nests of robbers became as secure as the counties about the metropolis, and some of the most inveterate vices were eradicated.¹ A single instance will suffice to illustrate the magnitude of the change. I have already quoted the picture from Fletcher of Saltoun of the extraordinary extent to which the habits of vagabond and shameless mendicancy were, at the end of the seventeenth century, spread through the whole Scotch nation. It is a singularly curious fact that when Pennant visited Scotland, in 1769, one of the features with which that acute English traveller was especially struck was the remarkable absence of beggars in a population that was still extremely poor. 'Very few beggars,' he said, 'are seen in North Britain; either the people are full masters of the lesson of being content with very little, or, what is more probable, they are possessed of a spirit that will

in boroughs, make their morning meal of it, and thereby wholly disuse the ale which heretofore was their accustomed drink; and the same drug supplies all the labouring women with their afternoon's entertainments to the exclusion of the twopenny. . . . As the lowest rank of housekeepers make use of tea, so the servants, particularly the females in better families, make it their morning and afternoon's diet.'—*Culloden Papers*, pp. 190, 193. According to Chambers, tea was first introduced into Scotland in the

parties of Mary of Modena at Holyrood, at the time when, on account of the excitement about the Exclusion Bill, it was thought prudent to send the Duke of York, as Governor, to Scotland.—*Traditions of Edinburgh*, p. 320.

¹ Thus Lord Kames said: 'The mildness with which the Highlanders have been treated of late, and the pains that have been taken to introduce industry among them, have totally extirpated depredations and reprisals, and have rendered them the most peaceable people in Scotland.'—*Hist. of Man*, bk. ii. sec. 9.

struggle hard with necessity before it will bend to the asking of alms.'¹

If I have been fortunate enough in the foregoing pages to exhibit clearly the nature and the coherence of the measures I have enumerated and the magnitude of the economical and moral revolution that was effected, the history can, I think, hardly fail to have some real interest for my readers. There are very few instances on record in which a nation passed in so short a time from a state of barbarism to a state of civilisation, in which the tendencies and leading features of the national character were so profoundly modified, and in which the separate causes of the change are so clearly discernible. Invectives against nations and classes are usually very shallow. The original basis of national character differs much less than is supposed. The character of large bodies of men depends in the main upon the circumstances in which they have been placed, the laws by which they have been governed, the principles they have been taught. When these are changed the character will alter too, and the alteration, though it is very slow, may in the end be very deep. To trace the causes, whether for good or ill, that have made nations what they are, is the true philosophy of history. It is mainly in proportion as this is done that history becomes a study of real value, and assuredly no historical school is more mischievous or misleading than that which evades the problem by treating all differences of national character as innate and inexplicable, and national crimes and virtues as the materials for mere party eulogy or party invective.

There is another and a much more serious school of

¹ Pinkerton's *Voyages*, iii. 45. See, too, Sinclair's *Survey of Scotland*, vi. 220; viii. 574. Some instances, however, of

strolling beggars are given by Sinclair under the head of 'Beggars.'

writers who regard legislation simply as the product and expression of a state of thought and feeling otherwise created, and will scarcely admit that it has any independent influence in moulding the characters or determining the progress of nations. In this theory there is, doubtless, a considerable element of truth. No law can be permanently efficacious if it is opposed to those prevailing moral and intellectual tendencies which we call the spirit of the age. The best are those which, being suggested by some previous want, respect very closely the customs and dispositions of the people, and fall in with the tendencies of the time. Englishmen, at least, are in general free from the delusion so prevalent on the Continent, that a nation which has been for generations ignorant, superstitious, intolerant, and enslaved, which has for ages been without the opportunities or the habits of political life, can be suddenly regenerated by removing every restraint and conferring upon it a democratic constitution. They know that the result invariably is either that the old despotism continues under a new name, or that a period of anarchy is followed by a period of reaction in which the small amount of liberty the nation might otherwise have enjoyed becomes impossible. They know that legislation greatly in advance of the nation for which it is intended will always prove pernicious or inoperative; that constitutions, in order to flourish, must grow out of the past condition of the country; that the system of government which is good for one nation is not necessarily good for another, and that the laws which were well suited for the infancy of a people are not equally suited for its maturity.

But although the effects of legislative and political influences on the formation of national character have been greatly exaggerated, although these effects probably diminish with the increasing complexity of society,

and with the increasing force of its spontaneous energies, they both have been, and are, very real. The results of great movements of moral or intellectual advance would often have been transient had they not been consolidated by laws which arrested in some degree the reflux of the wave, kept the higher standard continually before the people, and prevented the tide of opinion from sinking altogether to its former level. Laws regulating the succession of property govern in a few generations the distribution of wealth, which more than any other single circumstance determines the social type, and thus affects the whole circle of opinions and of tastes. A skilfully framed system of national education has often contributed largely to settle the unfixed opinions of a nation, and has always done very much to establish the character and the grade of national civilisation. By offering endowments for the cultivation of some one class of talents or the propagation of some one class of opinions, the legislator, if he abstains carefully from shocking any strong national prejudice, may gradually invest those particular talents with a consideration they would never otherwise have possessed, and attract to those opinions a very disproportionate amount of the national ability. On the other hand, a great legislative injustice festers in the social body like a wound and spreads its influence far beyond the part immediately affected. The habits of arrogance, of servility, and of lawlessness it produces will propagate themselves from class to class till the whole type of the nation becomes more or less perverted.

Of the good effects of legislation upon national character we can hardly have a better example than is furnished by the succession of laws I have enumerated, beginning with the establishment of the Scotch Kirk in 1690, and ending with the abolition of hereditary jurisdictions in 1746. But although from this time the

history of Scotland was one of uninterrupted progress there were still dark shadows on the picture, and it was many years before the English level of civilisation was altogether attained. Even torture, which had always been illegal in England, was legal, and was practised in Scotland after the Revolution, and was only abolished by the Treason Act of 1709. The last traces of serfdom disappeared in England about the time of James I., but in Scotland colliers and labourers in the salt works were in a condition of serfdom during the greater part of the eighteenth century. They were legally attached for life to the works on which they laboured. Their children were bound to the same employment in the same place, and on the sale of the works their services were transferred to the new owner. It was only in 1775 that an Act was passed for their emancipation.¹ Judicial corruption in England, in spite of one or two exceptional cases, may be said to have ceased at the Revolution, but in Scotland there is reason to believe that it was largely practised far into the eighteenth century.² The political system was even more corrupt and more illusory than that of England; for while the borough members were elected by the magistrates and town councils, the qualification for the county members was so high that the whole representation was often in the hands of a few families. The character of the Scotch members was lowered by the fact that for many years after the Union they alone received regular wages for their attendance in Parliament,³ their greater poverty exposed them specially to temptation, and one of the worst effects of the Union on imperial politics was the great accession it gave, in both Houses, to the corrupt

¹ Eden's *Hist. of the Poor*, i. 417, 418.

² See Chambers' *Traditions of Edinburgh*, 117-120.

³ See some particulars of these payments in Dunbar's *Social Life in Former Days*, pp. 214, 215.

influence of the Crown. It was, indeed, the custom in England to regard the Scotch as the most slavish and venal of politicians, and the reproach was not wiped away till the Reform Bill of 1832 gave Scotland a real representation, and created constituencies surpassing those of any other part of the kingdom in the average of their intelligence, purity, and liberalism.

It must be added, however, that the systematic support which Scotch members and Scotch peers were accustomed to give to successive ministries did not extend to purely Scotch questions. The very unpopularity of Scotchmen drew them together, and in this class of questions they showed themselves singularly shrewd, tenacious, and implacable in their resentments. The admirable habit of conferring together on purely local matters and adopting a common line of policy before the discussions in Parliament, which has given the Scotch contingent nearly all the weight of a national legislature, was early adopted. It appears to have begun at the time of the organised opposition to the malt tax in 1713,¹ and it has contributed largely to promote the interests of their country. The murder of Captain Porteous in 1736, the complete impunity of the murderers, the weakness shown by the Provost, and the manifest connivance of a large part of the inhabitants of Edinburgh,² were followed by a severe Bill disabling the

¹ *Lockhart Papers*, i. 417, 429.

² It would be useless and foolish to attempt to describe again an episode which Sir Walter Scott has made the subject of perhaps the most masterly historical picture in the language, but I may quote two curious passages illustrating the state of Scotch feeling about it. General Moyle, who was commanding at Edinburgh, wrote

to the Duke of Newcastle (Sept. 9, 1736): 'I can't but mention to your Grace that this is the third prisoner within the memory of man that has been taken out of a tolbooth here, and barbarously murdered by the mob. They charge me with procuring Porteous's reprieve, and threaten to murder me in my bed or set fire to my house; but I despise them all. I don't

Provost from holding any public office, and at the same time depriving the city of its charter and of its guards, and taking away the gates of the Netherbow. The opposition of the Scotch was so fierce and general that the measure was at last reduced to one disabling the Provost from holding any future office, and imposing on the city the very moderate fine of 2,000*l.* for the benefit of the widow of Porteous. But the design against the city was never forgiven, and the animosity of the Scotch legislators against Walpole did much to hasten his fall.¹ One Scotch member, named Anstruther, had voted for the original Bill, and he received a regiment as the price of his vote; but when he afterwards visited his estate in Scotland, he found it necessary to assume a disguise in order to escape the vengeance of the people. When his election was contested, the Scotch members voted to a man against him, and when, as late as 1751, he was accused on account of some alleged misgovern-

hear that any of the criminals are yet apprehended, though well known by many of the inhabitants of the town.' The Earl of Islay, writing a little later (Oct. 16) to Sir R. Walpole, says: 'The most shocking circumstance is, that it plainly appears the high-flyers of our Scotch Church have made this infamous murder a point of conscience. One of the actors went straight away to a country church where the Sacrament was given to a vast crowd of people, as the fashion is here, and there boasted of what he had done. All the lower rank of the people who have distinguished themselves by pretences to a superior sanctity, speak of this murder as the hand of God doing justice; and my endeavours

to punish murderers are called grievous persecutions. I have conversed with several of the parsons, and I observe that none of those that are of the high party will call any crime the mob can commit by its proper name. Their manner of talking, were it universal, would extirpate religion out of the world for the good of human society and, indeed, I could hardly have given credit to the public reports of the temper of these saints if I had not myself been witness of it and been admonished by one of them to have regard to the divine attribute of mercy, (in English) to protect the rebels and murderers.' — Coxe's *Walpole*, ii. 361, 367.

¹ Coxe's *Walpole*.

ment at Minorca, the animosity of his countrymen was still conspicuously apparent.¹

The manners of the people continued for some time to reflect very clearly their former degradation. The modes of life produced by a long period of abject wretchedness are never at once removed by the introduction of comparative prosperity. What began by the force of necessity continues by the force of habit, and more than one generation must pass before it is changed. Industrial habits were rapidly growing, but it was a long time before they reached the English level.² In spite of their admirable education, in spite of their Protestantism, in spite of their growing industry, the aspect of the Scotch population in the latter years of the eighteenth century was still extremely repulsive to an English eye. All the squalor of dress, person, and dwelling that now shocks the traveller in some parts of Ireland was exhibited in the Lowlands, and it was accompanied by a striking absence of the natural grace, the vivacity, the warm and hospitable spirit of an Irish population. These latter qualities existed, indeed, in Scotland, but only in the Highlands, and the tone of manners in the north and south of the country is said to have presented a stronger contrast than could be furnished by any other nation in Europe.³ The many solid

¹ Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* i. 56-61.

² Topham, in his *Letters from Edinburgh* in 1774 and 1775, was much struck with the aversion to trade still prevailing in Scotland. Lord Kames gives a curious illustration of the growth of commercial habits. 'In Scotland,' he says, 'an innocent bankrupt imprisoned for debt obtains liberty by a process termed *cessio bonorum*. From the year 1694 to the year 1744 there were but

twenty-four processes of that kind, which shows how languidly trade was carried on, while the people remained ignorant of their advantages by the Union. From that time to the year 1771 there have been thrice that number every year, taking one year with another—an evident proof of the late rapid progress of commerce in Scotland.'—*Hist. of Man*, bk. i. sec. 4.

³ An intelligent traveller, who visited Scotland in 1787, gives

and noble elements of the Scotch character might, indeed, be clearly discerned, but many years had still to pass before the nation reached its present high standard in the externals of civilisation.

One evil of a different kind proved very inveterate. However great may have been the services which, in some respects, the Scotch Kirk has rendered to its country, it is incontestable that the religious bigotry it produced far exceeded that of any other considerable body in the kingdom, and its influence for evil as well as for good may even now be deeply traced in the character of the people.

The history of the Scotch Kirk, and the nature of the influence it exercised, have been treated, not many years ago, with great power, but with some prejudice, by one of the most thoughtful and eloquent of the historians of England. Buckle has, indeed, fully recognised its undoubted services to political liberty, but he has not, I think, done justice to the good effects of a stern moral discipline acting, during many generations,

the following description of the aspect of the people : ' The common people of Scotland are more than a century behind the English in improvement ; and the manners of the Lowlanders in particular cannot fail to disgust a stranger. All the stories that are propagated of the filth and habitual dirtiness of this people are surpassed by the reality : and the squalid, unwholesome appearance of their garb and countenances is exceeded by the wretchedness that prevails within their houses . . . Whole groups of villagers fly from the approach of a traveller like the most untamed of savages.' On the other hand, the Highlanders ' are courteous in their manners,

civil in their address, and hospitable to the utmost extent of their little power. Their houses, it is true, are mean and inconsiderable ; but within they are often as clean as their poverty will allow ; and their doors are never closed against the necessities or curiosity of a stranger. This marked distinction between two races of inhabitants of the same country is curious, and, I believe, quite unparalleled in any other nation ; neither does it seem to wear off in the degree that might be expected in the common progress of improvement.'—*Skrine's Travels in the North of England and part of Scotland*, pp. 71, 72.

on a people singularly wild, wayward, and anarchical ; to the strength of character infused into the nation by the fervent, though narrow, religious zeal with which all classes were saturated ; or to the educational value of a system in which every sermon was an argument, and all the problems of religion were perpetually submitted to popular discussion. The Scotch Kirk is, indeed, a body which it is not very easy for those who are not in sympathy with its theology to judge with equity. Few forms of religion have been more destitute of all grace or charm, more vehemently intolerant, and at the same time more ignorant and narrow. Those who take any wide or philosophical view of religious phenomena will find it peculiarly difficult to sympathise with men who, assuming the genuineness, authority, and absolute infallibility of the whole body of canonical writings without question and without discrimination, excluded on principle all the lights which history, tradition, patristic writings, or Oriental research could throw upon their meaning ; banished rigidly from their worship every artistic element that could appeal to the imagination and soften the character ; condemned in one sweeping censure almost all Churches, ages, and religious literatures, except their own, as hopelessly benighted and superstitious, and at the same time pronounced, with the most unfaltering assurance, upon the most obscure mysteries of God and of religion, and cursed, with a strange exuberance of anathema,¹ all who diverged from the smallest article of their creed.

The Scotch ministers succeeded, indeed, in impressing their doctrines, with a peculiar definiteness, on the minds of their people, and in forming a high standard of principle, and a rare energy of conviction ; but their system was not one to produce any real

¹ See an amusing instance of this in Burton, ii. 70.

modesty of judgment, any gentleness or generosity of character, any breadth or variety of sympathy. Superstitious and intolerant as was the Catholic Church, it was at least in these respects superior. In a religion that rests ultimately on authority, there is always something to mitigate the extreme arrogance of ignorant dogmatism. In a great and ancient religion, comprising within itself the accumulated traditions, literatures, and superstitions of many nations and of many centuries, influences from distant and various quarters are at least brought to bear upon the mind, and insular habits of thought are in some degree corrected. Popes and Councils may define their dogmas, every instrument of coercion or persuasion may be employed to reduce the mighty mass to uniformity, but still the religion will practically assume many forms. There will be degrees of realised belief, and types of devotion adapted to different characters, national peculiarities, and grades of intellect and knowledge ; while a worship and a mythology appealing largely to the imagination, and a devotional literature appealing largely to the feelings, will supply an atmosphere in which religious minds can expatiate without concentrating themselves unduly on the dogmatic side of their faith. In the Scotch Kirk a bare, hard, and narrow dogmatism was the very essence of religion, and was enforced with an intolerance that has never been surpassed.

Of all the reformers, none breathed a spirit of such savage fanaticism as John Knox ; and there was certainly no branch of the Protestant clergy who so long and so steadily denounced every form of religious toleration as his successors.¹ It is wholly untrue that they were intolerant only in self-defence, and towards those whose principle was intolerance of

¹ The reader may find, without going further, numerous il-

lustrations of this fact in Buckle, Macaulay, and Burton.

others. The last and one of the very worst instances in British history of the infliction of death for the expression of religious opinions was the execution, in 1697, of Thomas Aikenhead, a young man of only eighteen, for the enunciation of some sceptical opinions which he was afterwards most anxious to recant, and this judicial murder was mainly due to the Scotch clergy.¹ The Scotch Nonjurors made it one of their charges against William that he had sinfully suffered James II. to escape, instead of bringing his head to the block.² For nearly a generation the Scotch ministers habitually denounced the toleration of Episcopalianism and of other Protestant sects with a vehemence quite as unqualified as that with which they had previously denounced the persecution directed against themselves; and when the Associate Presbytery seceded from the Establishment they announced in their 'testimony' that the institution of religious toleration was among the foremost 'causes of God's wrath against sinful and back-sliding Scotland.'³ In no part of the British Empire—I imagine in no part of Protestant Europe—were prosecutions for witchcraft so frequent, so persistent, and so ferocious as in Scotland, and it was to the ministers that the persecution was mainly due. They employed all their influence in hunting down the victims, and they sustained the superstition by their teaching long after it had almost vanished in England.⁴ Hundreds of wretched women have on this ground been burnt in Scotland since the Reformation, and the final sentence was preceded by tortures so horrible, various, and prolonged, that several

¹ See Macaulay's *Hist.* c. xxii.

² Macaulay, c. xvi.

³ Burton's *Hist. of Scotland*, ii. 321, 332, 333.

⁴ Much evidence on the subject of Scotch witchcraft will be found in Dalzell's *Darker Super-*

stitions of the Highlanders; Pitcairn's *Criminal Trials of Scotland*; Burt's *Letters*, and Sir Walter Scott's *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*. I have myself elsewhere referred to the subject.

prisoners died through the torment.¹ As late as 1678 ten women were condemned to the flames on a single day on the charge of having had carnal intercourse with the devil.²

Even when the superstition had to a great degree died away among educated laymen, the influence of the clergy over the populace was such that acquittal itself was sometimes insufficient to save the life of the victim. A curious and very detailed contemporary account is preserved of a case of this kind which occurred in 1704–1705 in the little town of Pittenweem in Fifeshire. A blacksmith in that town, having long been ill, at last declared himself to be suffering from witchcraft, and accused seven women as the culprits. They were at once arrested; a petition was presented from Mr. Cowper, the minister of the town, and from the Town Councillors for a commission to try them; but the Earl of Rothes, who was the sheriff, having instituted an inquiry, detected the imposture and released them. Among them was a poor, ignorant woman named Jane Corphar. When first ‘committed prisoner to the tolbooth upon suspicion of being a witch, she was well guarded with a number of men, who, by pinching her and pricking her with pins, kept her from sleep many days and nights, threatening her with present death unless she would confess herself guilty of witchcraft;’ and she herself alleged that Mr. Cowper had beaten her with his stick on her denying her guilt. The intended effect was produced; and wearied out with pain, sleeplessness, and terror, she confessed whatever they desired. On being visited, however, by the magistrates, she at once asserted

¹ Thus we find that of twenty-six persons who were condemned to the flames at Aberdeen in 1595 and 1596, three died under torture. The rest were burnt.—

Kennedy's *Annals of Aberdeen*, i. 169–172.

² Arnot's *Hist. of Edinburgh*, pp. 193, 194.

her innocence, declared that her previous confessions were all lies and were made 'to please the minister and the bailies,' and succeeded in obtaining her release. But the minister again appeared on the scene. It was stated that when the poor woman was charged with having renounced her baptism she gave the unmeaning, and probably purely ignorant, answer that 'she had never renounced it but to the minister.' For this offence Mr. Cowper summoned her to the church, threatened her, and of his own authority ordered her to be confined in a prison that was in the building. She succeeded in escaping, but next day was arrested by the minister of a parish eight miles off, who, without giving any notice to the magistrates, sent her in custody to the minister of Pittenweem. 'When she came to Mr. Cowper she asked him if he had anything to say to her; he answered, "No."' It was now evening, but it was with great difficulty she could find anyone in the town to shelter her. The storm was rapidly gathering around her. Next morning a fierce crowd had collected, who 'went,' writes our informant, 'to Mr. Cowper and asked him what they should do with her. He told them he was not concerned, they might do what they pleased with her. They took encouragement from this to fall upon the poor woman, three of the minister's family going along with them, I hear.' They seized her, beat her unmercifully, tied her so hard with a rope that she was almost strangled, dragged her by the heels through the streets and along the shore, bound her fast to a rope which they stretched at a great height between a ship and the land, swung her to and fro till they were weary—throwing stones at her meanwhile—and at last dashed her violently to the ground, all being ready to receive her with stones and staves. Her two daughters rushed in and fell upon their knees before the mob, imploring at least to be permitted to speak one word to their

mother before she expired; but they were driven away with fierce threats. At last, after 'three hours' sport, as they called it,' the woman was killed; the populace compelled a man with a sledge and horse to drive several times over her head, and they placed her mangled corpse under a heap of stones at the door of the woman who had given her shelter on the previous night, whom they threatened with a similar fate. It was noticed that in his sermon on the following Sunday the minister did not introduce a single sentence expressing reprobation of the murder to which he had so largely contributed.¹

This episode is probably typical of many others. Under the teaching of the Scotch clergy, the dread and hatred of witches rose to a positive frenzy; and the last execution for witchcraft, as well as the last execution for heresy, in the British Empire, took place in Presbyterian Scotland. As late as 1727 a mother and daughter were convicted of witchcraft; the daughter succeeded in escaping, but the old woman was burnt in a pitch-barrel.² The associated Presbytery, in 1736, solemnly denounced the repeal of the laws against witchcraft as an infraction of the express word of God.³

Other extravagances, if less pernicious, were even more grotesque. Thus, some of the clergy denounced the use of 'fanners' to winnow corn as impious, because by them men raised an artificial breeze in defiance of Him who maketh the wind to blow 'where it listeth';⁴ they denounced inoculation, till late in the eighteenth century, as flying in the face of Providence and endeavouring to baffle a divine judgment;⁵ they denounced

¹ See the very interesting letter describing the tragedy, in Dunbar's *Social Life in Former Days*, pp. 268-273.

² Burt's *Letters*, i. 230, 231.

³ Burton, ii. 334.

⁴ See a Note to Burt's *Letters*, i. 176.

⁵ Buckle's *Hist.* ii. 380, 381.

There are, however, several instances of the clergy having used their influence to promote the practice. See under 'Inoculation,' in Sinclair's *Survey of Scotland*.

in repeated resolutions the legal vacation in December as a national sin, because it implied some recognition of the superstitious festival of Christmas;¹ and they sometimes even thought it necessary to interfere on the same ground to put down the custom of eating a Christmas goose.² A picture of Christ, attributed to Raphael, formed part of a small collection which was exhibited in 1734 at Edinburgh and Perth. In the latter city it was at once denounced from the pulpit; a furious mob, shouting 'Idolatry!' 'Popery!' and 'Molten images!' surrounded the house where it was. It was saved with difficulty, and soon after the Seceders solemnly enrolled among the national sins of Scotland the fact that 'an idolatrous picture of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was well received in some remarkable places of the land.'³

Theatres, assemblies, dancing, light literature, gaieties at weddings, all those forms of popular festivity which brighten the hard lot of the labouring poor, were inexorably condemned. An assembly for dancing which was established at Edinburgh in 1710 was denounced from the pulpit, attacked by a furious mob, and the doors were on one occasion perforated with red-hot spits.⁴ The first circulating library in Scotland, which was set up by Allan Ramsay in 1728, was denounced; and the magistrates were induced to take measures against it because it was made the means of disseminating plays and other light literature.⁵ The Scotch Sabbath became a proverb throughout Europe. Even after the Revolution, the magistrates in Edinburgh employed men called 'seizers,' whose function was to patrol the streets and arrest all who were found walking on Sunday during

¹ Macaulay's *Hist.* c. xiii.

² Dunbar's *Social Life in Former Days*, p. 128.

³ Chambers' *Domestic Annals*

of Scotland, iii. 564, 565.

⁴ Chambers' *Traditions of Edinburgh*, p. 57.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 25.

sermon time.¹ On that dreary day it was esteemed sinful to walk in the fields, to stand in the streets, to look out of the window, to suffer little children to play, to travel even on the most urgent occasions, to pursue the most innocent secular recreation or employment, to whistle, to hum a tune, to bathe, or, in the opinion of some ministers, even to shave. Very few things affect so largely the happiness and the true civilisation of a people as the manner in which they are accustomed to spend the only day of the week on which, for the great majority of men, the burden of almost ceaseless labour is intermitted. In Scotland, as far as the Church influence could extend, every element of brightness and gaiety on that day was banished, every form of intellectual and æsthetic culture was rigidly proscribed. In every parish a Kirk Session was established, consisting of the minister and his elders, who often employed spies to discover offences, and pried incessantly, not only into the opinions, but also into the domestic relations and private pursuits and manners of the parishioners; and the minister summoned offenders before the congregation, imposed upon them public and shameful penances, and if they resisted subjected them to excommunication, which, in the existing state of society, cut them off from all intimate intercourse with their neighbours, and blasted their temporal and, as they believed, also their eternal prospects.² There was, in truth, more real religious liberty in the seventeenth century at Naples and in Castille than in the Western Lowlands of Scotland.

This system cannot be exactly termed priestcraft, for the minister was strictly controlled by the congregation; and the elders, who were all laymen, took part

¹ Arnot's *Hist. of Edinburgh*, p. 192.

² See many curious particulars about the Kirk Sessions in Burt.

Burton has analysed their discipline with much care. See, too, Buckle's masterly chapter on the Scotch Kirk.

in his judicial acts. As far, however, as freedom of action and liberty of dissent were concerned, it had the effects of a crushing sacerdotal tyranny; and it was supported by language about the claims and prerogatives of the Kirk, hardly less arrogant and imperious than that which issues from the Vatican.

The palmy days of this Church despotism were in the seventeenth century and in the early years of the eighteenth. From this time, many influences contributed gradually to weaken it. The cessation of persecution, the secure position of an established Church, the growth of industrial life, a more intimate connection with England, and also those intellectual agencies which during the eighteenth century were steadily lowering the theological temperature throughout Europe, had all their influence in Scotland. In the great centres especially an opposition arose, and Allan Ramsay, Pitcairn, and a few others, bitterly assailed the pretensions of the clergy. A lady who was a very keen observer of the habits of her time, and who died at a great age, near the close of the eighteenth century, had the happy thought of writing down the changes of manners that occurred in Scotch society during her own life, as well as those which she had gathered from the lips of her older relations, and she has furnished us with several curious particulars illustrating the movement. The infusion of English ideas after the Union was very rapid. Some of the most considerable persons in Scotland were obliged to pass half the year in London, and naturally came back with a certain change in their ideas. The under-officers of the Court of Exchequer and the Boards of Customs and Excise established in Scotland, were chiefly English, and being men of fashion they were hospitably received in the best Scotch society, and gradually modified its tone. About the same time the custom was largely extended of sending young men of fortune to Holland

for their education, and permitting them afterwards to make a tour through France; and French manners, and to a certain degree French morals, began to penetrate into Scotch society. Luxury increased, and the severity of domestic discipline which had once prevailed rapidly disappeared. In the early years of the century we are told, 'Every master was revered by his family, honoured by his tenants, and awful to his domestics. His hours of eating, sleeping, and amusement were carefully attended to by all his family, and by all his guests. Even his hours of devotion were marked that nothing might interrupt him. He kept his own seat by the fire or at the table with his hat on his head, and often particular dishes were served up for himself that nobody else shared of. His children approached him with awe, and never spoke with any degree of freedom before him. The consequence of this was that except at meals they were never together.' There was a reverence for parents and elderly friends and generally an attention to the old which in the latter part of the century was unknown. The position of servants was still very humble. They had 'a set form for the week of three days broth and salt meat, the rest meagre, with plenty of bread and small beer.' Until vails were abolished, the yearly wages of men-servants were only from 3*l.* to 4*l.*, those of maid-servants from 30*s.* to 40*s.* The tables were covered with many dishes, and fine table-linen was greatly prized, but the gentry still ate off pewter, and few persons except the richest noblemen kept a carriage. Girls, even in good families, were taught very little beyond reading, writing, and plain work. They spent their time chiefly in working tapestry or curtains for the house, and in reading long romances or books of devotion; they rarely appeared in public except at church, and at the great gatherings for baptisms, marriages, or funerals; and their chief task was to repeat psalms and

long catechisms, in which they were employed an hour or more every day, and almost the whole day on Sunday. 'They never eat a full meal at table. This was thought very indelicate, but they took care to have something before dinner, that they might behave with propriety in company.' The intercourse of men with women, however, though not less pure, was much less reserved than in the latter part of the century. 'They would walk together for hours or travel on horseback or in a chaise without any imputation of imprudence.' The character of 'a learned lady' was greatly dreaded, and it was acquired by a very slight knowledge of the current literature of the time. Our informant has preserved from the recollections of her uncle a curious record of the ordinary way of spending Sunday in a gentleman's house in the first years of the century. At nine the chaplain read prayers to the family. At ten the whole household went regularly to church, which lasted till half-past twelve. At one the chaplain again read prayers, after which they had cold meat or an egg, and returned to church at two. The second service terminated at four, when they betook themselves to their private devotions, except the children and servants, who were convened by the chaplain and examined. This continued till five, when dinner was served. A few male friends usually partook of this meal, and sat till eight. It was followed by singing, reading, and prayers conducted by the master himself, after which all retired to rest. 'The fear of hell and deceitful power of the devil were at the bottom of all their religious sentiments.' Almost every old house had its haunted chamber, where few dared to sleep; and dreams and omens were in high repute even among the most educated.¹

¹ See the 'Remarks on the Change of Manners in my own Time,' by Mrs. Elizabeth Mure,

in the *Caldwell Papers* (Maitland Club), i. 259-272.

All this, in the upper classes at least, gradually changed, and it was noticed that the decline of religious terrorism advanced step by step with the softening of the relations between parent and child, and between master and servant. In 1719 the Presbytery of Edinburgh passed some very characteristic resolutions lamenting the decadence of piety.¹ They complained among other things that the people were now accustomed to walk or stand in the streets before or after service time on Sunday, that they even wandered on that day to fields and gardens, or to the Castle Hill, or stood idly gazing from their windows, and that 'some have arrived at that height of impiety as not to be ashamed of washing in waters and swimming in rivers upon the holy Sabbath.' Amateur concerts took root in Edinburgh about 1717.² Two or three years later the fashion of large gatherings at the tea-table came in, and exercised a wide social influence, and about the same time clubs began rapidly to multiply.³ A love of dancing spread in certain circles, and was bitterly censured and deplored, and it was noticed by the more rigid Presbyterians, as a circumstance of peculiar poignancy, that the Cameronian March, called by the name of the saintly Cameron, was a favourite tune.⁴ A weekly assembly for dancing, and private balls carried on by subscription, began in Edinburgh to take the place, as centres of social intercourse, once occupied by the gatherings at baptisms, marriages, and burials;⁵ and about 1726 we even find a theatre established, though its existence was long very precarious.⁶ There was

¹ Arnot's *Hist. of Edinburgh*, p. 204.

² Chambers' *Domestic Annals*, iii. 432, 433.

³ *Caldwell Papers*, i. 269, 271.

⁴ See the curious extracts from a book of Patrick Walker, pub-

lished about 1723, in Chambers' *Domestic Annals*, iii. 483.

⁵ *Caldwell Papers*, i. 267.

⁶ Chambers' *Domestic Annals*, iii. 520. In Glasgow the first theatrical performance appears to have been in 1728. Wodrow

as yet little or no scepticism, and attendance at the Kirk was universal, but some preachers had arisen who entirely discarded the old style of dogmatic preaching, who banished from their sermons every description of religious terrorism, and were accustomed to represent the Christian religion chiefly as the purest rule of morals, the belief in a particular providence and a future state as the support in every trial, the distresses of individuals as necessary for exercising the affections of others, and the state of suffering as the post of honour. This kind of preaching became especially popular after the rebellion of 1745, when ideas of liberty were widely diffused. The phrase 'slavery of the mind' came then into common use. Nurses were dismissed for talking to the young of witches or ghosts, and the old ministers were ridiculed who preached of hell and damnation.¹ It must be added that, by one of those curious contrasts not unfrequent when Churches aim at an excessive austerity, there existed in the midst of a rigid and externally decorous society a large amount of the most extravagant dissipation. We read of a Hell-fire Club in Edinburgh, and of a Sweating Club, whose members perpetrated infamous street outrages like those of the Mohocks in London, and it is certain that during a great part of the eighteenth century hard drinking and other convivial excesses were carried among the upper classes in Scotland to an extent considerably greater than in England, and not less than in Ireland.²

says that in that year 'two things happened pretty singular, which twenty or thirty years ago would have been very odd in Glasgow—the setting up of an Episcopalian meeting-house, and public allowing of comedies.'—Wodrow's *Analecta*, iii. 436.

¹ *Caldwell Papers*, i. 269, 270. In 1774 Topham describes Deism

as very prevalent in Scotland, though an external conformity to the Kirk was strictly enforced.—*Letters from Edinburgh*, p. 238.

² Ample evidence of this will be found in Chambers' *Traditions of Edinburgh*, and in Dean Ramsay's *Reminiscences*. Mrs. Mure mentions how an entire hogshhead

This evil, however, appears to have been more in the second than in the first half of the century. In the second half of the century also, the kind of preaching I have described became more common in the fashionable quarters of the great towns. A small but very eminent party arose in the Established Church of Scotland, who fully reflected the more enlightened tendencies of their time; and among their ministers we find the great names of Blair, Ferguson, Home, Reid, and Robertson. This school, however—distinguished and admirable as it was—was almost confined to the great cities, and it had no real root among the people. It has been observed with truth that every popular schism in Scotland was inspired, not by a desire to innovate, but by a desire to restore the sterner discipline of the past. The empire of the Kirk over the greater part of Scotland, and over the poorer and middle classes, was but little shaken during the eighteenth century; and although it is scarcely possible for a Christian Church to exercise a supreme influence over a people without producing some excellent moral effects, it also contributed largely to narrow, darken, and harden the national character. The general standard of external decorum was, indeed, so far higher than in England, that it was said that a blind man travelling southwards would know when he passed the frontier by the increasing number of blasphemies he heard. If there was a somewhat unusual amount of hypocrisy and censoriousness, no one who reads the letters of the time will question that there was also a very large amount of simple and unostentatious piety; while order, industry, and truthfulness were admirably dis-

of wine was drunk at the marriage of one of her friends. 'The women,' she says, 'had a good share; for though it was a dis-

grace to be seen drunk, yet it was none to be a little intoxicate in good company.'—*Caldwell Papers*, i. 263-265.

played. The industrial virtues, however, for which Scotchmen are so eminently distinguished, can only be very partially attributed to the influence of the Kirk; for they spring naturally and almost spontaneously from good secular education and from an advanced industrial civilisation, while in some other branches of morals no great improvement has been effected. It is well known that the statistics of drunkenness and the statistics of illegitimacy show that in point of sobriety the Scotch nation ranks among the lowest in Europe, and in point of chastity below either of the other parts of the kingdom. I cannot find that the discipline of the Scotch Kirk has ever had an influence in repressing drunkenness at all comparable to that which was exercised by Father Mathew in Ireland, and which was felt for an entire generation. Offences against chastity occupied a very prominent place in the proceedings of the Kirk Sessions and of the Scotch legislators, and penalties of an absurdly exaggerated description were employed to repress them. In 1695 thirty-two women of ill-fame were transported from Edinburgh to the American plantations.¹ Offenders of a less serious kind were compelled to do public penance before the congregations in the churches, and, among other punishments, to stand in the pillory. The effects were what might have been expected. The extreme publicity given to these matters had no tendency to diminish the offence; the spectacle of the public penances attracted to the Kirk those who would certainly have found no other charm within its walls; and the excessive severity of the penalties imposed on the fallen led to a very serious increase of child-murder. On one day in the last century, four women were executed in Edinburgh for this offence; and they all

¹ Chambers' *Domestic Annals*, iii. 115.

declared that the dread of the pillory had prompted them to the crime.¹ In the Northern districts the influence of the Kirk in this, as in other respects, appears to have been less felt; and it is somewhat remarkable that, in spite of all the efforts of the clergy, a great Scotch writer was able to state, long after the middle of the eighteenth century, that 'in the Highlands of Scotland it is scarce a disgrace for a young woman to have a bastard.'²

Some of the higher and more attractive features also of the Scotch character are to be attributed, not to the action of the Kirk, but to a widely different source. We have seen in the foregoing pages how marked had been the opposition between the Highlands and the Lowlands, and in how great a degree the pacification and civilisation of Scotland depended upon the increasing predominance of the latter. It would, however, be a great mistake to suppose that the Highlands contributed nothing beneficial to the Scotch character. The distinctive beauty and the great philosophic interest of that character spring from the very singular combination it displays of a romantic and chivalrous with a practical and industrial spirit. In no other nation do we find the enthusiasm of loyalty blending so happily with the enthusiasm for liberty, and so strong a vein of poetic sensibility and romantic feeling qualifying a type that is essentially industrial. It is not difficult to trace the Highland source of this spirit. The habits of the clan life, the romantic loyalty of the clansman to his chief, the almost legendary charm that has grown up around Mary Queen of Scots and around the Pretender, have all had their deep and lasting influence on the character of the people. Slowly, through the course of many years, a mass of traditional feeling

¹ Arnot's *Hist. of Edinburgh*, p. 193.

² Lord Kames' *Hist. of Man*, bk. i. sec. 6.

was formed, clustering around, but usually transfiguring, real facts. The devotion which sprang up among the countrymen of Knox, and in defiance of the hard Puritanism of the Kirk, to the mournful memory of the Catholic Queen, is one of the most touching facts in history. It was noticed by Dempster, only thirteen years after the tomb of Mary had been removed from Peterborough to Westminster Abbey, that devout Scots were accustomed to make pilgrimages to it as to the tomb of a martyr. It was supposed to have wrought numerous miracles, and is probably the last tomb in the kingdom to which this power has been ascribed.¹ The clan legends, and a very idealised conception of clan virtues, survived the destruction of feudal power; and the pathos and the fire of the Jacobite ballads were felt by multitudes long after the star of the Stuarts had sunk for ever at Culloden. Traditions and sentiments that were once the badges of a party became at last the romance of a nation; and a great writer arose who clothed them with the hues of a transcendent genius, and made them the eternal heritage of his country and of the world.

¹ Stanley's *Westminster Abbey*.

CHAPTER VII.

ON March 6, 1754, Henry Pelham died, and the peace which had so long prevailed in English politics at once terminated. For rather more than three years from this time the political stage presented an aspect of almost unexampled turbulence and confusion. In the vicissitudes of this period, however, there is but little of permanent interest, for they sprang neither from party divisions, conflicting principles, nor disputed measures, but solely from the rivalry of a few great houses, and from the incessant jealousies of a small circle of statesmen. The actors in the preceding struggle had for the most part passed away. Orford and Bolingbroke were dead ; Bath had lost all power, and Granville all ambition ; and Chesterfield, though he exercised some influence as a mediator in 1757, was content with a subordinate position, and contributed little to the history of the time. The most prominent, or at least the most influential, statesman of the old generation was the Duke of Newcastle, who upon the death of his brother became Prime Minister of England.

Newcastle is certainly the most remarkable instance on record of the manner in which, under the old system, great possessions and family or parliamentary influence could place and maintain an incapable man in the first position in the State. In private life or in a subordinate office the glaring weaknesses of his character would have been comparatively unnoticed, and he would have been justly respected as a man of pure morals, warm affections, and sincere and unaffected piety. Unfor-

tunately, however, he inherited a greater parliamentary influence than any other English noble, and he was devoured by the most feverish and insatiable ambition. Without any of the aims or capacities of a legislator, or any sordid desire for the emoluments of office, he delighted beyond all earthly things in its occupations, interests, and dignity, in the secret and corrupt management of Parliament, in the dispensation of bribes, places, and pensions. George II. complained that he was unfit to be Chamberlain to the smallest court in Germany, and he was the object of more incessant ridicule than any other politician of his time; but yet for forty-six years he held high posts at the Court or in the Government. For nearly thirty years he was Secretary of State; for ten years he was First Lord of the Treasury. His co-operation proved essential to the success both of Walpole and of Pitt, and no statesman or combination of statesmen could long dispense with his assistance. Intellectually he was probably below the average of men, and he rarely obtained full credit even for the small talents he possessed. He was the most peevish, restless, and jealous of men, destitute not only of the higher gifts of statesmanship, but even of the most ordinary tact and method in the transaction of business, and at the same time so hurried and undignified in manner, so timid in danger, and so shuffling in difficulty, that he became the laughing-stock of all about him. Lord Wilmington said of him that he always appeared to have lost half an hour in the morning, and to be running after it all the rest of the day. Associated with such men as Walpole and Pitt, he was often treated with gross contempt, and he was incessantly imagining slights where none were intended, indulging on the smallest provocation in violent explosions of grotesque irritability, and employing all the petty arts of a weak man to maintain his position among more powerful com-

petitors. His confused, tangled, unconnected talk, his fulsome flattery, his promises made at the spur of the moment and almost instantly forgotten, his childish exhibitions of timidity, ignorance, fretfulness, and perplexity, the miserable humiliations to which he stooped rather than abandon office, his personal oddities, and his utter want of all dignity and self-control made him at once one of the most singular and most contemptible figures of his time.

Yet there were many worse men, and many more dangerous politicians. Chesterfield, who knew him well, and who seldom erred on the side of indulgence, described him as ‘a compound of most human weaknesses, but untainted with any vice or crime;’ and most of his faults sprang much more from extreme feebleness, inconstancy, and nervousness, than from any deeper cause. He was good-natured, placable, and on the whole well-meaning, indefatigable in the discharge of business, a respectable writer of official despatches, a ready though ungraceful debater. He originated nothing, and discouraged every measure that might arouse opposition; but the very timidity of his nature kept him for the most part in harmony with the wishes of the people, and he was guilty, during a career of unexampled length, of very little harshness, violence, or injustice. He was a steady upholder of the Hanoverian dynasty; he assisted during many years one of the best Home Ministers and the greatest Foreign Minister the country has ever possessed. He had the merit of bringing Hardwicke into office, and he secured his lifelong confidence and attachment. In foreign politics he was a consistent supporter of the Austrian interest; and although he sometimes yielded too much to the German tendencies of the King, he appears to have had a real feeling for the honour of England. Though he cannot be acquitted of an inveterate passion for intrigue, the

charge of deliberate and aggravated treachery to Sir R. Walpole, which Horace Walpole has brought against him, is, I conceive, both false and malignant. Newcastle differed from Walpole in desiring England to take a more energetic part in continental affairs, just as he afterwards differed for a similar reason from his own brother. He remained in office after the retirement of Walpole at Walpole's express desire, and he exerted all his influence, and no small amount of dexterity, to shield him from impeachment.¹ The darkest stain upon his memory is the alacrity with which he sacrificed Byng to the popular clamour. The great evil of his ascendancy was the gross, systematic, and shameless corruption which he practised. In his time it was impossible even for an able man to govern Parliament without corruption, but Newcastle vastly increased the evil, discredited and degraded his party, and left the standard of political morality lower than he found it. At the same time, though a great corrupter of others, he was not himself corrupt. During his official career he reduced his fortune from 25,000*l.* to 6,000*l.* a year, and he refused a pension when he retired.

Such was the statesman who, on the death of Pelham, became the head of the Government. The position, however, of leader and manager of the House of Commons remained vacant, and it was fiercely contested. Of the ablest men in Parliament, there was indeed one who had no political ambitions. The silver-tongued Murray—the most graceful, luminous, and subtle of all legal speakers—was at this time Attorney-General, and although there was no height of political greatness to which he might not have aspired, he resolutely turned aside from the rugged path of statesmanship. His eyes

¹ Walpole to Devonshire, Feb. 2, 1741-2. Coxe's *Walpole*, iii. 592. Coxe's *Pelham*, i. 29, 30.

were fixed upon the calm dignity of the Bench, and he soon after, as Lord Mansfield, took his place among the greatest of English judges. Two men, however, whose influence was almost equal, and whose names were destined during two generations to be in the foremost rank of politics, were looking eagerly to the vacant place. These were Henry Fox and William Pitt, who were afterwards known as Lord Holland and Lord Chatham, and who at this time filled respectively the offices of Secretary at War and Paymaster of the Forces. The first—a bold, bad man, educated in the school of Walpole, but almost destitute of principle, patriotism, and consistency—possessed rare talents for business and for intrigue, and social qualities which gave him great influence, and won for him much affection. Without any of the higher imaginative qualities or any of the lighter graces of oratory, his clear, strong sense, his indomitable courage, and his admirable tact, readiness, and memory, made him one of the most formidable of debaters. He had obtained, by the force of his personal attractions, and without the advantage of either rank or wealth, a considerable parliamentary following, and his position was strengthened by the somewhat hesitating favour of the King, by the friendship of the Duke of Cumberland, and by a close political alliance with the Duke of Bedford. He was known to be ambitious and unscrupulous, and it did not yet appear that he cared more for money than for power. Pitt was an incomparably greater man, both in intellect and character, and having just married the sister of Lord Temple, he had obtained the support of the Grenville connection; but his lofty and unaccommodating character, and his arrogant temper, had impaired his popularity in the House; his denunciations of Hanover and of the Hanoverian policy of the Court, had made him, beyond all other politicians, obnoxious to the King; he was dis-

liked and feared by Newcastle, and at the time of the death of Pelham, as in many other critical moments of his career, he was disabled by the gout.

I do not propose to follow in detail the long series of vicissitudes, intrigues, dissensions, and combinations that followed. They were not determined by political, but by personal motives. They have been minutely described by many historians, and they belong to a class of facts which in the present work I desire, as far as is consistent with the clearness of my narrative, to avoid. It will be sufficient to say that Newcastle first offered the leadership of the House to Fox, but insisted upon retaining in his own hands the distribution of the secret-service money and the nomination to the Treasury boroughs, or, in other words, the administration of corruption; that Fox refused the leadership when clogged by this restriction; that Newcastle, relying on the almost complete absence of formal opposition, then entrusted the vacant post to Sir Thomas Robinson, a politician of no ability or standing; that Fox and Pitt at once composed their differences, and resolved to make this arrangement impossible; that instead of adopting the plain and honourable course of resigning their positions, they remained in office, and at the same time devoted all their talents to ridiculing and discrediting their new leader, and that the covert sarcasms of Fox and the scarcely disguised denunciations which Pitt directed not only against Sir Thomas Robinson, but also against Murray and Newcastle, soon made the position of the Government intolerable. It is evident that this course was an outrageous violation of the most ordinary rules of political loyalty and honour, and it is equally evident that any prime minister of common firmness would have instantly and at all hazards dismissed a subordinate who was guilty of it. Instead of taking this step, Newcastle, with characteristic timidity,

preferred to make new overtures to Fox, who after some negotiation accepted them, desisted from his covert opposition to his chiefs, disclaimed in private all connection with Pitt, and, although he was unable as yet to obtain the position of Secretary of State as he desired, he was called to the Cabinet Council in January 1755, and obtained some promotions for his adherents in the ministry.

In peaceful times these personal intrigues might have long continued to run their course without any other effect than that of lowering the level of political morality. The clouds of war were, however, now gathering heavily over the distant horizon. The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle had left the respective frontiers of the English and French colonies in America almost undefined. The limits of immense provinces, in a great degree uninhabited and even unexplored, were necessarily very vague, and the French and English colonists were both animated by fierce national antipathy. Each side aspired to complete ascendancy in North America, and each side had tribes of Indians ready to fight in its cause. On the cession of Acadia or Nova Scotia to England, commissioners had been appointed to determine the frontiers of the province, but they had been wholly unable to agree; the English maintaining, and the French strenuously denying, that the tract around the Bay of Fundy was included in the ceded territory. A still more serious question arose about the line of the great lakes, of the Ohio and of the Mississippi. The English, immediately after the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, had given an English mercantile company the exclusive right of trading with the Indians, and founding colonies on the banks of the Ohio, and some scattered settlements were already established. The French, on the other hand, determined to connect by a long chain of forts their Canadian colonies with Louisiana, and thus

to cut off New England from all communication with the central part of America. They maintained that the whole basin of the great rivers behind the Alleghanies formed part of Canada. They supported their claim by launching war-ships on Lake Ontario, and by rapidly throwing out outposts and founding forts along the Ohio; and the Marquis Duquesne, who was governor of Canada, sent a formal message to the governors of New York and Pennsylvania, announcing that France would permit no English settlements on that river.

Under these circumstances hostilities speedily broke out. The Board of Trade reported to the King that 'as the French had not the least pretence of right to the territory on the Ohio . . . it was a matter of wonder what such a strange expedition in time of peace could mean, unless to complete the object so long in view of conjoining the St. Lawrence with the Mississippi,' and Lord Holdernes, the Secretary of State, sent orders to the governors of Pennsylvania and Virginia to repel force by force, 'whenever the French were found within the undoubted limits of their provinces.' In the course of 1754 a few slight conflicts took place. A project of erecting an English fort near the point where the Monongahela flows into the Ohio was defeated by a French occupation, and a French fort, named after Duquesne, was established on the spot. The name of George Washington, then a young man of twenty-two, the son of a planter of Westmoreland county, on the Potomac, now appears for the first time in history. In 1753 he had been sent on a vain mission to negotiate with the French about the limits of their frontier, and in the following year he was despatched to the Ohio at the head of about 400 soldiers. In May 1754 a skirmish took place, in which the French commander was killed, but soon after Washington was attacked by a very superior force and compelled to capitulate. Remonstrances were

made by the English ambassador at Paris. The colonial legislatures exhibited great disunion and incapacity, but still additional forces were raised, and, as the approach of a great war was felt to be imminent, the army estimates at home were increased. Troops were withdrawn from Ireland, and in October Major-General Braddock, a favourite officer of the Duke of Cumberland, was despatched to America with about 2,000 troops.¹

All these circumstances greatly added to the difficulties of Newcastle, and the popular feeling against him rose higher and higher. His conduct was a miserable exhibition of weakness and vacillation. He was now past sixty. He had spent a long life in official pursuits, and he was entirely incapable of breaking the habits he had formed. His love of office had become an absolute disease, and the idea of sacrificing it was intolerable to his mind. He was the undisputed leader of a party which possessed an immense majority in both Houses. Yet no minister was ever less able to control insubordinate colleagues, or to conduct a great war. He was incapable of taking any resolution, his mind veered with every breath of opposition, and with the exception of his Chancellor, Lord Hardwicke, he had hardly a sincere friend in the Cabinet. Pitt, sullen, irritated, and bitterly aggrieved with both Fox and Newcastle, confined himself to his own department, and took no pains to conceal his disgust and his contempt. 'Your Grace knows I have no capacity for these things,' he shortly answered when consulted about the difficulties in America, 'and therefore I do not desire to be informed about them.' The debates on the Marriage Act had made Fox and Hardwicke deadly enemies. Leicester House, for the first time since the death of the last Prince of Wales, had begun to take an active

¹ Hildreth's *Hist. of the United States*. Bancroft. Walpole's *George II. Sparks' Life of Washington*.

part in politics, and the influence of the Princess Dowager was exerted against the Government, and especially, on different grounds, against Newcastle and against the Duke of Cumberland. The universal feeling of the country was one of despondency, for men felt that great dangers were approaching, and that the hand which held the rudder was miserably weak. As a very acute observer¹ writes, 'There was no violence, no oppression, no particular complaint, and yet the nation was sinking by degrees, and there was a general indisposition proceeding from the weakness and worthlessness of the minister who would embrace everything, and was fit for nothing.' The French made propositions for peace, but they appeared utterly unacceptable. They proposed to leave the valley of the Ohio in the condition in which it had been at the opening of the last war, and afterwards that both countries should retire from the country between the Ohio and the Alleghanies, leaving the country to the north and west of the Ohio in French possession. They claimed this territory on the double ground of discovery and of possession. French missionaries and French explorers had penetrated much farther to the west than the English; and since the Peace of Utrecht, while the English were chiefly employed in developing the country they had occupied, the French threw out many scattered forts in a country wholly uninhabited by their rivals. The English, on the other hand, held that when they had established a settlement on the eastern coasts of America, their claims, as against any other European Power, extended in the same latitude from sea to sea; they considered it a matter of the most vital importance to prevent their colonies from being inclosed between the ocean and a hostile Power, and they met the French proposals by

¹ Dodington's *Diary*, May 1755.

demanding the cession of the coast of the Bay of Fundy, and the destruction of all forts built by the French in the disputed territory. The maritime preparations of the French were in the meantime rapidly pressed on. A squadron destined for America, and carrying 4,000 soldiers, sailed from Brest for America, and a British fleet was sent out, under Boscawen, to follow, and if it entered the St. Lawrence to intercept it. The French, suspecting the design, succeeded, under shelter of a fog, in evading the English, but two ships which had been detached from the French fleet were attacked by the English and captured.

After the news of this aggression, which had taken place without any declaration of war, and in spite of the pacific assurances of Newcastle, the French ambassador was immediately recalled. The next advices from America brought an account of the surprise and capture, by 3,000 English troops, of the French forts recently established at Beau Séjour, on the Bay of Fundy, and soon after the news arrived of a very serious disaster on the Ohio. In July 1755 General Braddock, at the head of about 2,000 men, having marched against Fort Duquesne, had been encountered by a smaller body of French and Indians, who concealed themselves in the long grass, and who, by an unexpected and well-directed fire, produced a panic and a rout. Braddock himself fell, about sixty officers were killed or wounded, and the whole force was put to flight. The perplexity of the situation was much increased by the absence of the King, who, contrary to the strong wish both of the ministers and of the people, had insisted on going with Lord Holderness to Hanover, leaving the government in the hands of a regency, of which the Duke of Cumberland was virtually the head. Many French merchant vessels from Martinico were now returning, and it was a great object, if possible, to intercept them. A new

fleet, under Sir Edward Hawke, was ready, and it was resolved to send it out; but the great question in the Cabinet was what instructions should be given to it. The Duke of Cumberland strongly urged that, as war was inevitable, the most vigorous measures should be taken. Fox, the Princess Dowager, and, with more hesitation, Lord Anson, who was at the head of the Admiralty, shared his view. Lord Granville appears to have vacillated, and he desired that hostilities should only be exercised against ships of war, and was absolutely against interfering with trade, which he called 'vexing your neighbours for a little muck.' The Chancellor desired to postpone matters and take no decisive and inevitable step. Newcastle himself was in a state of pitiable alarm. At one time he suggested that 'Hawke should take a turn in the Channel to exercise the fleet, without having any instructions whatever;' he then urged in turn that Hawke should be ordered not to attack the enemy unless he thought it worth while, that he should not do so unless their ships were more together than ten, that he meant this only of merchant ships—for, to be sure, he must attack any squadron of ships of war—that he should take and destroy all French ships of war, but no merchantmen, that he should be restrained from taking any ships except ships of the line.¹ Ultimately it was decided as a compromise that war should not be declared, but that Hawke should be ordered to take all French ships of war and merchantmen. Letters of marque were issued to cruisers, and by the end of 1755 300 French merchant ships and 7,000 or 8,000 French sailors were brought into English ports. The French, who were resolved to put England clearly in the wrong, and who had also not quite completed their preparations, ab-

¹ Dodington's *Diary*, July *moirs*, pp. 45-49. Walpole. 1755. Lord Waldegrave's *Me-* Smollett.

stained from declaring war, released an English ship of war which some French ships had captured, and very naturally stigmatised the proceedings of the English as simple piracy. In the meantime the press for seamen in Great Britain and Ireland was stringently carried out, the great towns subscribed large premiums over and above the bounty given by the Government for all who voluntarily enlisted as soldiers or sailors, and the Government having resolved to raise a million by way of lottery, for military purposes, no less than 3,880,000*l.* was at once subscribed.¹

While these events were taking place, the King was, as usual, mainly occupied with Hanover. It could scarcely fail, in case of war, to fall into the hands of the French, and there were some fears that France might obtain the support of Prussia, by offering its annexation as a bribe. The subsidiary treaties with Saxony and Bavaria had just expired, and the King made a new treaty with Hesse, and opened negotiations for a treaty with Russia. Such treaties, binding England to pay large sums to foreign soldiers for the defence of the King's foreign dominions, though, as the event showed, they were very reasonable, and indeed necessary to the security of England, were in the highest degree unpopular, and no one who knew Pitt could question that under the circumstances in which he then stood he would make use of this unpopularity to the utmost. Newcastle had an interview with him, and tried to conciliate him by the offer of a seat in the Cabinet, by hopes of further promotion, by entreaties that would under any circumstances have been humiliating, but which were doubly so when coming from an old to a young man, and from a Prime Minister to a refractory subordinate. Pitt treated him with

¹ Smollett. Walpole.

contemptuous arrogance, induced Legge, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to refuse to sign the warrants for the subsidy; and on the opening of Parliament in November 1755 he was the foremost orator in denouncing the treaties, and compelled Newcastle to dismiss him. Legge underwent the same fate, and two members of the Grenville family accompanied them into retirement.

The treaties were carried, but the Government was shaken to the basis. Fox had just before received the seals as Secretary of State. Lord Barrington, one of the most servile politicians of the time, became Secretary at War in his place; Sir Thomas Robinson, who was the especial favourite both of Newcastle and the King, but who was entirely incapable of taking a foremost position in Parliament, returned to his old place at the Wardrobe with a pension of 2,000*l.* a year on the Irish establishment; and a few minor changes were made. The majority of the Government in Parliament was still considerable and unbroken, and with the assistance of Fox and Murray its debating power was very formidable; but opinion outside the House was now strongly against it, and, with the exception of a single measure, its policy exhibited extreme inefficiency. The exception was the treaty, which was signed in January 1756, with the King of Prussia, by which both parties agreed not to suffer foreign troops of any nation to enter or pass through Germany. Frederick had for a long time made the English King one of his favourite subjects of ridicule and abuse, had intrigued largely with the Jacobites, and appears to have entertained some hopes that, in the event of a revolution in England, he might annex Hanover to his dominions.¹ But the excellent intelligence which he obtained from all the chief capitals in Europe convinced him that the day

¹ See Lord Stanhope's *Hist. of England*, iv. 72.

for ambition was past, and that a cloud was slowly gathering over his head which threatened him with utter, speedy, and almost inevitable ruin.

The lapse of years and the vicissitudes of fortune had done nothing to allay the passionate hatred with which Maria Theresa regarded him, and she was prepared to make any sacrifice, to endure any humiliation, to engage in any war, if she could only recover Silesia, and avenge the wrongs which she had suffered. Count Brühl, who exercised an absolute control over the government of the Elector of Saxony, was scarcely less implacable in his hatred, and very soon after the Peace of Dresden these two were negotiating in secret on the possibility of an alliance against Prussia. Saxony as yet feared to enter into any formal alliance, but at the suggestion of Brühl overtures were made to the Czarina Elizabeth, who then governed Russia, and they were speedily successful. The Czarina had been the object of some of the scurrilous jests of Frederick, and a bitter resentment had been kindled in her mind. Reports of Prussian intrigues against Russia were industriously circulated by agents of Brühl. The dangers of a new great military Power were set forth, and a secret compact was made between the Empress and the Czarina to which Saxony soon after acceded, the object being on the first opportunity to reduce Prussia once more to the condition of a fourth-rate Power. But in order that the plan should have a prospect of success it was necessary that the neutrality, if not the assistance, of France should be secured, and this became the great object of Maria Theresa. All the traditions of French policy were in the opposite direction. France had long looked upon Austria as her chief enemy upon the Continent. For generations it had been her main object to reduce Austrian influence, and especially to support every German Power that opposed her. But she had already

very recently shown how little she was wedded to traditional policy when in alliance with England she turned her arms against the French prince whom Lewis XIV. had placed on the throne of Spain, and she now made a change which was scarcely less startling. Madame de Pompadour, who then exercised an almost absolute rule over the counsels of Lewis XV., had made overtures to Frederick which had been repelled with bitter scorn. It was certainly no high sense of female virtue that animated him, but he had a contempt for women, he delighted in wounding them by coarse jests, which spared neither the virtuous nor the vicious, and he exasperated Madame de Pompadour into a deadly enmity. Kaunitz, the ambassador of Maria Theresa at the Court of France, completed the work by presents and by flatteries delivered in the name of the Empress, which soon secured the unbounded attachment of Madame de Pompadour to the Austrian cause.¹

Nor were arguments of a purely political nature wanting. By espousing the side of Austria in her quarrel with Prussia, France could purchase, if not the alliance, at least the neutrality of Austria, in the war with England which was impending. To a far-seeing French statesman it could not appear desirable that a great military Power should grow up on the frontiers of France; and the very reasons that induced her to support the smaller German States against Austria now induced her to prevent the rise of a new State which might one day be scarcely less formidable. The history of the last war also was eloquent in favour of the alliance. Austria and France had both expended torrents of blood and millions of money, they had both ended the war exhausted and impoverished, yet neither

¹ It is commonly said that Maria Theresa wrote to the French mistress with her own

hand, but Arneth in his *Hist. of Maria Theresa* has thrown great doubt upon the story.

had gained anything by the struggle. Each side had experienced the most crushing disasters, and in each case these disasters were mainly due to the sudden aggression or to the sudden desertion of Frederick. And the Sovereign who had proved so false to both parties, who had brought such calamities on both parties, who had played so skilfully for his own selfish purposes upon their resentments and their ambitions, had remained the only gainer by the contest. Was it desirable that this drama should be repeated—that a Power should be consolidated strong enough to turn the balance in every contest between the two great rivals on the Continent, a Power certain to seek its own aggrandisement by inflaming their mutual animosities, and by depressing each in turn? Nor was this all. The territory most coveted by France was the Austrian Netherlands. Both for purposes of aggression and for purposes of defence, influence over those strong places would prove invaluable to her policy; but all her attempts to seize, or at least to hold, them had failed through the alliance of Austria and the maritime Powers. But to Austria this distant province, in which she held only a divided rule, was much less important than Silesia, and she was prepared in the event of recovering her ancient province that Mons should be ceded to France, and that Don Philip, of Parma, should exchange his Italian dominions for the Austrian Netherlands.

These propositions were the basis of a negotiation which was only very slowly matured. It was not until May 1756, nearly four months after the treaty between England and Prussia, that a compact of neutrality and defensive alliance was signed between Austria and France, by which the former Power engaged to observe complete neutrality in the war between England and France, and the latter to abstain from every attack

upon the Austrian dominions, while in all contingencies that did not arise out of that war each Power guaranteed the territory of the other. It was not until the following year that France, in conjunction with Sweden, which she subsidised, drew the sword against Prussia and signed a treaty for her partition. But as early as the middle of 1755 negotiations with this object had begun, and Frederick learnt enough from a clerk in the Dresden archives to realise the danger that was impending, and the importance of seeking an English alliance, which alone was open to him. On the other hand, England, finding Austria unwilling to support her, gladly accepted an arrangement which saved Hanover from the possible contingency of a Prussian invasion, and in the more probable event of a French invasion enlisted in its help the best army in Germany.

For the rest, nothing could be more deplorable than the condition of England, and the years 1756 and 1757 were among the most humiliating in her history. French preparations made at Dunkirk and Brest, apparently intended for a descent upon England, produced the wildest alarm. It was stated that there were only three regiments in the country fit for service, and 'the nation,' in the words of Burke, 'trembled under a shameful panic too public to be concealed, too fatal in its consequences to be ever forgotten.' Urgent appeals were made to the Dutch to send over once more the 6,000 soldiers which they had engaged by the Barrier Treaty of 1709 to furnish whenever the Protestant dynasty was in danger. The Dutch, however, were resolved not to thrust themselves into a European war on account of England, and they persisted in their neutrality, contending that the treaty did not bind them to take part in a conflict which was in reality not one between the House of Brunswick and the House of Stuart, but between the French and English settlers in

America, and also that England, by seizing French ships without a declaration of war, was clearly the aggressor. In the preceding year it had been popular to denounce the policy of subsidising German troops as a scandalous sacrifice of English to Hanoverian interests, but now it was to German troops that the Government turned for the defence of England. To the great indignation of Pitt, who declared that the resources of the country were sufficient for its defence, a large body of Hessian and Hanoverian soldiers were brought over at the desire of the Parliament, and distributed through the country. It would be difficult to conceive a measure more irritating to the national pride, but the defences had been so deplorably neglected that in case of invasion it might have proved very necessary. As Lord Waldegrave wrote, 'we first engaged in a war, and then began to prepare ourselves.' As Pitt himself said, the country was so unnerved 'that 20,000 men from France could shake it.'

It soon appeared, however, that the alarms of a French invasion were groundless, and that the real object of the movement of troops in Picardy, Normandy, and Brittany was to divert the attention of the English Government from an expedition that was fitting out at Toulon for an attack upon Minorca. The design was perfectly successful. The English Government continued to disbelieve in the Toulon expedition till it was too late to intercept it, and on April 10, 1756, a fleet of twelve ships of the line, with an army of about 14,000 men¹ under the command of that old voluptuary the Duke of Richelieu, sailed unmolested from Toulon for Minorca, where a landing was effected without opposition on April 17. The British troops,

¹ From 13,000 to 14,000, according to Byng. See his letter to the Admiralty, in *Beatson's Naval and Military Memoirs*,

i. 468. According to another version the French numbered 16,000.

under General Blakeney, numbered less than 3,000 men, and they at once abandoned the open towns as indefensible, and concentrated themselves in the Castle of St. Philip, which the French proceeded to besiege. It was impossible that it could long hold out without succour; but three days before the French expedition had started from Toulon, the Government, being at last convinced of the reality of the danger, had sent out Admiral Byng, with ten ships of the line, to defend Minorca. Every stage of the expedition exhibited mismanagement or timidity. The ships of Byng were miserably ill-manned, and they had to be partially refitted at Gibraltar. Scarcely any marines were taken on board, and only a single regiment for the relief of Minorca. Byng was directed to demand a battalion at Gibraltar to reinforce the little army of Blakeney; but the commander having called a council of war, it pronounced the garrison to be so weak that no soldiers could be spared without imminent danger. On May 15 war had been at last declared by England against France, and on the 19th the fleet of Byng appeared off Minorca, where it was next day encountered by the French. After a partial and indecisive engagement, night drew on, and the Admiral, having summoned a council of war, represented to it that in his opinion the relief of St. Philip's with his present resources was impracticable. He urged that the French fleet was superior to his own in men and metal, that it was extremely doubtful whether a complete naval victory could save Minorca, that there were scarcely any troops to be landed, that in the absence of marines those few were necessary for the safety of the fleet, and that even if they were thrown into the castle they would be quite insufficient to save it. He added that Gibraltar might very probably at once be attacked, and that owing to the weakness of

its garrison it would be in great danger if the only British fleet in the Mediterranean were destroyed. Under these circumstances, he determined, with the unanimous consent of the council, to draw off his fleet, to cover Gibraltar, and to await reinforcements.

St. Philip's, left to itself, was taken, after a brave resistance, on June 28; and thus Minorca, which contained one of the finest harbours in the Mediterranean, and which was one of the most valuable fruits of the Peace of Utrecht, passed into French hands.¹

In America the war was less eventful, but hardly more successful. After the disaster of General Braddock, a slight success had, it is true, illumined the English fortunes. In the September of 1755, General Johnson, at the head of a body of rather more than 3,000 colonists and Indians, had defeated an almost equal French force under General Dieskau, near Lake George, and the French commander, mortally wounded, fell into the hands of his enemies. But no results followed, and in the August of the following year the important fort of Oswego was captured by Montcalm, and 1,600 men and about 120 cannon fell into the hands of the French. Numerically the French colonists were but a handful as compared with the English, but by superior energy and skill they had hitherto on the whole maintained an ascendancy in the war.

Nor was it only in Europe and in America that the year 1756 was disastrous. Almost ever since the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, the French and English colonists in India had been contending against each other by intrigues and sometimes by arms. On the French side, since the recall and disgrace of La Bourdonnais, Dupleix was without a rival, and, though miserably

¹ All the more important documents and facts relating to this expedition are collected in Beat-

son. See, too, Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* vol. ii.

neglected by the Home Government, he had done very much to extend the dominions of France. Vain, ostentatious, and perfectly unprincipled, he was yet admirably adapted to build up a great Oriental empire. His ambition was boundless. He was eminently skilful both in intrigue and in organisation, and he discovered with the eye of a true statesman the real conditions, weaknesses, and tendencies of Indian politics. He was the first European statesman who understood the possibility of giving to native soldiers the discipline and the efficiency of a European army, who clearly realised the immense superiority in war of a small disciplined force over the great native armies of India, and who engaged on a large scale and with real knowledge in native contests. On the death of Aurungzebe, in 1707, the great Mogul Empire had fallen into a condition of complete atrophy, if not dissolution; the real power passed into the hands of a multitude of nabobs or viceroys, who, while owning a nominal allegiance to the Court of Delhi, had become in fact independent and hereditary sovereigns in their several provinces, while in the absence of any strong central authority the country was torn by repeated rebellions, invasions, and disputed successions.

Under circumstances so favourable for a policy of aggrandisement, Dupleix adopted with great skill the course of selecting his own candidate in cases of disputed succession, deciding the conflict by French arms and obtaining as his reward immense concessions of territory or power. He thus, after a few years of able and audacious policy, succeeded in establishing an almost complete ascendancy over the Carnatic, and indeed over the whole of the Deccan, and became by far the greatest potentate in India. The English watched his progress with great jealousy and alarm, but for a considerable period they

were unable to arrest it, and they feared with much reason that the consolidation of French power in the Carnatic would be followed in the next war by the subjugation of Madras. They accordingly threw their whole energies into the contest, and by the military skill of Lawrence, and especially of Clive, who was then a young captain in the service of the Company, the whole aspect of affairs was gradually changed. In 1752 and 1753, while there was still peace between England and France, war was raging in the Carnatic, and after several brilliant English victories the French power in that province was almost shattered. The victory was completed by the French Government itself, who recalled and disgraced Dupleix in 1754, leaving the English candidate undisputed nabob of the Carnatic, and giving India a short interval of peace. But in 1756 a new danger had arisen from another quarter. Surajah Dowlah, the Viceroy of Bengal, one of the most powerful and most ferocious of the princes of India, having quarrelled with the English on some trivial pretext, marched upon Calcutta, captured both the town and fort after a very short resistance, and in the fierce heat of an Indian June his soldiers thrust 146 English prisoners for a whole night into the Black Hole, a prison cell only eighteen feet by fourteen, from which in the morning but twenty-three came forth alive.

Long before the news of this ghastly tragedy had reached Europe, the cloud of war which had been slowly gathering over Germany had burst. Frederick had certain knowledge that a league comprising France, Russia, Austria, and Saxony, was formed against his little State of five million inhabitants. No other European country in proportion to its population was so purely military as Prussia, and its army, under the skilful direction of the King, had been raised to the highest efficiency; but the disproportion of numbers was so

overwhelming that ruin appeared inevitable. The only possibility of success lay in a sudden attack which might crush some members of the league before they were prepared, and disconcert the plans of the others. France was not yet ready to enter into the field. Russia was very distant, and rapid successes in Saxony and Austria might even now change the course of events. At the end of July 1756, Frederick despatched a peremptory message to Maria Theresa demanding an explanation of the military preparations of Austria, and on receiving, as he expected, an evasive answer, he at once marched at the head of 60,000 men upon Dresden. The Saxon army, which consisted of about 18,000 men, retired to Pirna, where it was at once blockaded. Dresden was captured. In the presence of the Queen, who had vainly tried to prevent it, the door of the archive-room was forced, the original documents disclosing the circumstances of the league against Frederick were abstracted, and their publication amply justified in the eyes both of contemporaries and of posterity the invasion of Saxony. An Austrian army, slightly inferior to that of Frederick, and commanded by Marshal Browne—whom Khevenhüller, when dying, had pronounced to be the ablest general in the Austrian service—marched to the relief of the blockaded Saxons; and Frederick, leaving a portion of his army before Pirna, hastened with the remainder to meet the Austrians. The battle took place on Oct. 1, at Lobositz, a village within the Bohemian frontier. It was long, bloody, and admirably contested, but Frederick ultimately compelled the Austrians to retreat, though his own losses in killed and wounded were greater than those of the enemy. Browne made another gallant but unsuccessful attempt to relieve the Saxons, and on the 16th the whole Saxon army capitulated. Their sovereign was allowed to retire to his Polish dominions. The officers were

dismissed on parole. The soldiers were compelled to enlist in the Prussian army, and Frederick retired to winter quarters in Dresden, where he levied crushing contributions on the Saxons for the support of the war.¹

While these events were taking place abroad, the distrust of the mismanagement of Newcastle was becoming stronger and stronger in England, and the Government, in spite of its parliamentary majority, was manifestly sinking. In October 1756 Fox sealed its fate by deserting his colleagues. He complained that Newcastle monopolised power, withheld his confidence, and mismanaged affairs, and he was too clear-sighted not to perceive that the Government was doomed, and that his safest course was to abandon it. Nearly at the same time the Chief Justiceship of the King's Bench became vacant, and Murray insisted upon obtaining it. Newcastle still made desperate efforts to avert resignation. He tried in vain by high political offers to induce Murray to abandon or defer his intention. He endeavoured in turn to persuade Pitt once more to join his administration, Lord Egmont to accept the lead of the House of Commons, Lord Granville to take the first place in the Government, leaving his present post of President of the Council to Newcastle. Every attempt, however, was in vain, and in November 1756 he resigned. Lord Hardwicke accompanied him into opposition, and Lord Anson, whose reputation was much sullied by the loss of Minorca, was at the same time dismissed from the Admiralty.

The King entrusted the formation of the new ministry to Fox, who made overtures to Pitt, but the latter peremptorily refused to serve with his rival. This com-

¹ Frederick, *Hist. des Sept Ans.* Carlyle, *History of Frederick the Great.*

bination having failed, a Government was, after much and difficult negotiation, formed in December by the Duke of Devonshire and Pitt, and supported by the Grenville connection. In this administration Devonshire succeeded Newcastle as First Lord of the Treasury, Legge became Chancellor of the Exchequer, Pitt succeeded Fox as Secretary of State. Lord Temple was placed at the head of the Admiralty; George Grenville succeeded Dodington as Treasurer of the Navy; and the Great Seal was put in commission. Great efforts were made to increase the army, and one of the earliest steps of Pitt was his famous measure of forming two regiments out of the Highland clans. It was important as providing a body of troops who have never been surpassed, and still more so as drawing into legitimate channels that exuberant martial spirit which was the secret of the insurrections and the anarchy of the Highlands. The merit of Pitt, however, in carrying it has been exaggerated. A Scotch regiment called the Black Watch had already served with distinction at Fontenoy, and, as we have seen,¹ the enlisting of Highlanders had been warmly approved of by Walpole, and its expediency was again pressed upon the Government in the early part of 1756.² Pitt, however, carried it into effect, he provided with much energy for reinforcing the British strength in America, and the mere pre-eminence in the Govern-

¹ See vol. i. p. 386.

² See a remarkable paper of recommendations presented to the Duke of Cumberland in May 1756, and by his order delivered to Pitt, in Dec. 1756. One of the recommendations is as follows: 'Two regiments, 1,000 men in a corps, may be raised in the north of Scotland for the said service [that of America]. . . .

No men in this island are better qualified for the American war than the Scots Highlanders.'—Almon's *Anecdotes of Chatham*, i. 166, 167. The suggestion is said to have been due to the Duke of Argyle. Beatson's *Naval and Military Memoirs*, ii. 2. See, too, the present Duke's *Scotland as it was and is*, ii. 80-87.

ment of a statesman in whom the nation had confidence did something to brace the flagging energies of his countrymen.

But it soon appeared evident that the Government could not last. Though the opinion of the country was incontestably and strongly in favour of Pitt, though the circumstances of the country were such that the presence of a man of genius and energy at the head of affairs was of transcendent importance, it is doubtful whether Pitt would have climbed to power had he not received the warm support of the Prince of Wales and condescended to gain the favour of Lady Yarmouth, the mistress of the King;¹ and it is certain that the first administration in which he exercised a preponderating power was one of the weakest in the reign. The majority in both Houses still looked on Newcastle as their chief; and the opposition of the great Pelham interest, and the ambiguous attitude of Fox, were fatal to the Government. Pitt during most of the winter was incapacitated by the gout; and the King, though well satisfied with the Duke of Devonshire, was bitterly hostile both to Pitt and to Temple. In February, in a conversation with Lord Waldegrave, he summed up with amusing frankness his opinion of their merits. He complained that Pitt 'made him long speeches which possibly might be very fine but were greatly beyond his comprehension, and that his letters were affected, formal, and pedantic; that as to Temple, he was so disagreeable a fellow there was no bearing him; that when he attempted to argue he was pert and sometimes insolent; that when he meant to be civil he was exceeding troublesome; and that in the business of his office he was totally ignorant.' The King was certainly no ad-

¹ Walpole's *George II.* ii. 259, 260. Shelburne's *Autobiography*. Waldegrave's *Memoirs*.

mirer of Newcastle, but he now turned to him in despair, and anxiously asked Lord Waldegrave whether the old statesman would again undertake the management of affairs. Lord Waldegrave described the Duke as in his usual condition, 'equally balanced between fear on one side and love of power on the other,' 'eager and impatient to come into power, but dreading the danger with which it must be accompanied.' 'I know,' answered the King, 'he is apt to be afraid, therefore go and encourage him; tell him I do not look upon myself as King whilst I am in the hands of these scoundrels; that I am determined to get rid of them at any rate; that I expect his assistance, and that he may depend upon my favour and protection.' The Duke of Cumberland at the same time strongly pressed the King that Pitt and Temple should be turned out without further deliberation, and he desired that a new administration should be formed before he set out for Hanover, where he was about to take the command of the electoral troops.¹

It happened, too, that on one important question both Temple and Pitt had incurred some transitory unpopularity in a manner that was greatly to their honour. When, during the administration of Newcastle, the news arrived of the surrender of Minorca, the indignation against Byng ran fierce and high. He was burnt in effigy in all the great towns. His seat in Hertfordshire was assaulted by the mob. The streets and shops swarmed with ballads and libels directed against him. Addresses to the King soon poured in from Dorsetshire, Huntingdon, Buckingham, Bedford, Suffolk, Shropshire, Surrey, Somerset, Lancashire, from most of the great towns, and especially from the City of London, calling for a strict inquiry into the causes of the fall of Minorca,

¹ Waldegrave's *Memoirs*, pp. 95-98.

and it soon became evident that the people would be satisfied with nothing less than blood. Newcastle, terrified to the utmost, was only too ready to offer up any scapegoat. 'Oh, indeed, he shall be tried immediately, he shall be hanged directly,' he is said to have blurted out to a deputation from the City who came to him with representations against the admiral. Fowke, the Governor of Gibraltar, was broken by the King; and Byng on his arrival was at once put in close confinement, and soon after brought before a court-martial. The trial lasted from December 21, 1756, till the 20th of the following January. The court fully acquitted Byng of all cowardice and of all disaffection, but while admitting that he had acted according to his conscientious judgment, they, after much hesitation and delay, pronounced that he had not done all in his power to destroy the French ships or to relieve Minorca, and that he was accordingly guilty of neglect of duty. Originally the Articles of War left it at the discretion of the courts-martial to inflict, according to the circumstances of the case, death or whatever other penalty they pleased in cases of neglect of duty, but about three years before the trial of Byng the articles had been remodelled, and the capital penalty was left without an alternative. The court, however, unanimously accompanied their sentence by a recommendation to mercy, and also by a very earnest representation to 'the Lords Commissioners for executing the office of Lord High Admiral.' 'We cannot help laying the distresses of our minds before your Lordships on this occasion,' they wrote, 'in finding ourselves under a necessity of condemning a man to death from the great severity of the 12th Article of War, part of which he falls under, and which admits of no mitigation even if the crime should be committed by an error of judgment only; and therefore for our own consciences' sakes, as well as in justice to the prisoner, we pray your

Lordships in the most earnest manner to recommend him to his Majesty's clemency.'¹

It appeared almost incredible that under such circumstances the sentence should have been carried out, and the opinion of the navy as well as the opinion of the court-martial was strongly and unequivocally in favour of remission. Pitt bravely urged its propriety, both publicly in Parliament, and in the closet of the King, but without effect. 'You have taught me,' said the King, when Pitt spoke of the dominant sentiment of the House of Commons, 'to look for the sense of my subjects in another place than the House of Commons.' Temple was equally courageous, but with his usual absence of tact he mortally offended the King by some expressions which he let fall, which were supposed to have compared the conduct of the admiral with that of the King at the battle of Oudenarde.² The most prominent members of the court-martial again individually urged in the strongest terms the gross injustice of executing the admiral for what was a mere error of judgment; and Voltaire, with characteristic humanity, sent to England a letter he had received from Richelieu, in which that commander spoke with high eulogy of Byng. But all these efforts were in vain. Newcastle and his partisans, though out of office, had lost little of their power. They imagined that by the execution of Byng they could win popularity, secure themselves from the indignation of the nation, and assist Lord Anson, who had been First Lord of the Admiralty when the disaster took place, and to whose neglect it was mainly to be attributed. Fox, who showed on this occasion what

¹ Walpole's *George II.* pp. 226-231, 284-293. Beatson's *Naval and Military Memoirs*, i. 501-513.

² This statement of Horace

Walpole, which appeared incredible to Macaulay, is partly corroborated by Lord Waldegrave. *Memoirs*, pp. 93, 94.

he showed more conspicuously in the next reign—the callous selfishness which lay below his superficial good nature—made great use of the unpopularity of Byng as a party weapon against Pitt, and Lord Hardwicke steadily laboured for his destruction. The unfortunate admiral exhibited in the last days of life an admirable courage; and his execution, which took place on March 14, reflected much more real discredit upon the nation that demanded it than the military disaster which caused it.¹

The execution of Byng, however, did nothing to restore the popularity of Newcastle, and his opposition to it did no lasting injury to that of Pitt. On April 5, 1757, three weeks after the tragedy had been consummated, the King struck the blow he had for some time meditated. Temple was dismissed; a few days later Pitt underwent the same fate, and after a term of office of less than five months the whole ministry was dissolved. It was followed by a very significant outburst of popular feeling. The stocks fell. The Common Council voted the freedom of the City to both Pitt and Legge. ‘For some weeks,’ in the words of Horace Walpole, ‘it rained gold boxes,’ and the nation showed beyond dispute that the statesman who was, beyond all others, the most disliked by the King and by the most considerable of the great nobles, was also the statesman in whom alone the English people had real confidence. For eleven weeks after his fall England was without a Government; and during all this time a great war was raging, difficulties and dangers were accumulating, the reputation of the country had sunk to the lowest ebb, and without a single real political principle being at issue the statesmen were divided by the most implacable hostility.

¹ Walpole's *George II. and Letters*. Waldegrave's *Memoirs*. Beatson's *Naval and Military Memoirs*.

At last, after numerous abortive attempts and unsuccessful combinations in which Newcastle bore the chief part, it became evident to most men that the union of the parliamentary influence of Newcastle and of the genius and popularity of Pitt was absolutely necessary, and in June 1757 a coalition ministry was formed which was the most successful in English history, and which speedily restored the fortunes of the nation. Newcastle returned to the Treasury. Legge became again Chancellor of the Exchequer. Pitt and Lord Holderness were Secretaries of State. Temple became Privy Seal, and Anson, to the surprise and indignation of many, resumed his post at the Admiralty.

All the leading parties had to sacrifice much. The King was bitterly hostile to Pitt, whom he had just dismissed, and was absolutely coerced by the Duke of Newcastle, who now, to his great indignation, distinctly told him that he would take no part in a Government of which Pitt was not a member, and who induced the most powerful Whig families to support him. Newcastle, on the other hand, had, a few weeks before, promised the King that he would never coalesce with Pitt. He had received from Pitt insults and injuries that must have rankled in the least sensitive nature, and he was compelled, after a severe struggle, to relinquish to Pitt all control over the conduct of the war, and to confine himself to the management of the Treasury. Pitt, too, had much to forget. He had learnt by experience that he had overrated his strength and his importance. He was compelled to unite with a statesman whom he had covered with ridicule and insult, whose alliance he had rejected with the most arrogant scorn, whose expulsion from public affairs he had made a main end of his policy. But a few months had passed since he had dilated with withering irony upon the conduct of Fox in uniting with Newcastle, comparing

it, in a well-known passage, to the junction of the two rivers at Lyons, and his language was now equally applicable to himself. He had, however, gained much. Animated by a real patriotism, and conscious of extraordinary powers as a War Minister, he now obtained the absolute direction of the war, an assured majority, and the leadership of the House of Commons, while it was not necessary for him to take any personal part in the corruption of its members. In his own words, he 'borrowed' the majority of the Duke of Newcastle to carry on the government of the country.

The part taken by Fox at this juncture was the most remarkable. Hitherto he had been in political weight at least equal to Pitt, and the great interest in parliamentary contests had lain in their rivalry. In the country, however, he was even more unpopular than Newcastle, and his political prospects had recently declined. It was certain that he could not form a ministry alone, and that Pitt would not combine with him on equal terms. It was more than doubtful whether a ministry of Newcastle and Fox, from which Pitt was excluded, could ever stand. Neither statesman appears to have believed it, and to both the combination would have been eminently distasteful. On the other hand, Fox's fortune was dissipated; he loved money, and he saw a chance of obtaining in a short time great wealth. The office of Paymaster of the Forces was a subordinate one, and did not even carry with it a seat in the Cabinet, but in time of war it was extremely lucrative. Fox therefore consented to accept it, became the subordinate of his ancient rival, and speedily amassed an enormous fortune.

The events which I have now very briefly sketched are important as showing the disorganisation into which the Whig party had fallen in the last days of George II.,

at a time when it possessed a complete monopoly of political power. At hardly any other period of English history did parliamentary government wear a less attractive aspect, and it is not difficult to discover the causes of the disease. Party government, in the true sense of the word, had for many years been extinct; Toryism had sunk into Jacobitism; Jacobitism had faded into insignificance; and the great divisions of politicians had almost wholly ceased to represent a division of principles or even of tendencies. Two or three times in English history something analogous to this has occurred, and it always brings with it grave political dangers. Such a state of affairs is peculiarly unfavourable to real earnestness in public life. Faction replaces party, personal pretensions acquire an inordinate weight, and there is much reason to fear lest the tone of political honour should be lowered and lest the public spirit of the nation should decline. But in periods when the parliamentary machine is completely controlled by the popular will, this state of party anarchy or amalgamation is not without its compensations. It continually happens that administrations become unpopular, not because the general principles of their policy are in conflict with the opinions of the country, but from isolated mistakes, from the feebleness or perversity of a particular minister. It is a great misfortune when Parliament is unable to transfer authority to more efficient hands without altering the whole system of national policy; yet, when the lines of party demarcation are strongly drawn, it is often impossible to do so. In times when party divisions cease to coincide with any clear division of principles, power will naturally pass to the ablest statesman; in other times, to the representative of the dominant principle. Besides this, it is at a time when the conflict of parties is in a great degree intermitted, that social reforms and ad-

ministrative improvements have most prospect of being attended to.

At the period I am describing, however, the absence of party divisions concurred with a great weakness of popular control, and with an almost complete absence of a reforming spirit among politicians, while the immense corrupt influences that had been gradually matured and concentrated, had made the chief political power in the nation almost hereditary in a few families. The voice of the people was, it is true, still sufficiently powerful—with the assistance of some minor influences—to force Pitt into the ministry; and the character of Parliament was still so popular that Newcastle, in spite of his large majority, was unable to carry on the government in opposition to the most powerful speakers. But yet a small number of great noblemen had acquired a complete control over so large a proportion of seats, that their combination made any opposing administration impossible; no government could be carried on without them, and the fluctuations of power were chiefly governed by their competition. And while the personal ambitions of the great families broke up the Parliament into numerous small factions, the conduct of the King aggravated the difficulty. His point of view, however mistaken, was at least very intelligible. He boasted, with much reason, that in the course of a long reign it would be impossible to cite a single case in which he had violated the constitution; but he had not yet fully acquiesced in the fact that the most important prerogative theoretically conceded to him had, by the force of facts, become little more than a fiction. He was told that it was his undoubted right to choose his ministers; and he contended that, if so, he had at least the right of excluding from office statesmen who were personally offensive to him. Such a right cannot, in practice, coexist with parliamentary government; but we can

hardly blame the King for having been slow to recognise the fact. That he greatly underrated the genius of Pitt is very true. He complained that he was totally ignorant of foreign affairs, prolix, pompous and affected in the closet and in his letters; and he probably shared the feeling that appears to have been common, that he was a mere visionary rhetorician. 'Pitt used to call me madman,' said old Lord Granville after one of the cabinet councils, 'but I never was half so mad as he.' But the chief causes of irritation were the violent and grossly offensive attacks which Pitt had made on Hanover and on the Hanoverian partialities of the King, the persistence with which he had sought popularity by pandering to the popular jealousy on the subject, and the utterly unreasonable opposition he had made to the measures for the protection of Hanover at a time when that country was exposed to imminent danger solely on account of an English quarrel in America. It is not surprising that the King should have bitterly resented these attacks, nor yet that he should have pronounced the English notions of liberty 'somewhat singular, when the chief of the nobility,' as he complained, 'chose rather to be the dependents and followers of a Duke of Newcastle, than to be the friends and counsellors of their sovereign.'¹

He yielded, however, at last, and from this time Pitt had no reason to complain. Lord Nugent, many years after, described in the House of Commons one of the early interviews between the King and his new minister. 'Sire, give me your confidence,' said Pitt, 'and I will deserve it.' 'Deserve my confidence,' was the answer, 'and you shall have it.' The promise was

¹ See Lord Waldegrave's very interesting report of the King's conversation on this matter.

Memoirs, pp. 132, 133. Also Walpole's account of this period. *Memoirs of George II.*

fully kept, and during the remainder of the reign Pitt was scarcely less absolute over military affairs in England than Frederick the Great in Prussia. Perceiving clearly the extreme danger of divided counsels in war, he even assumed a complete control of the navy, insisting that the correspondence of the naval officers, which had always been vested in the Board of Admiralty, should be given over to him, and even that the Board should sign despatches which he wrote, without being privy to their contents.¹ From the middle of 1757 to the death of George II. there was no serious opposition to his will, and the history of England was little more than the history of his policy.

We may here, then, conveniently pause to examine in some detail the character and policy of this most remarkable man, who, in spite of many and glaring defects, was undoubtedly one of the noblest, as he was one of the greatest, who have ever appeared in English politics. There have, perhaps, been English statesmen who have produced on the whole greater and more enduring benefits to their country than the elder Pitt, and there have certainly been some whose careers have exhibited fewer errors and fewer defects; but there has been no other statesman whose fame has been so dazzling and so universal, or concerning whose genius and character there has been so little dispute. As an orator, if the best test of eloquence be the influence it exercises on weighty matters upon a highly cultivated assembly, he must rank with the very greatest who have ever lived. His speeches appear, indeed, to have exhibited no pathos, and not much wit; he was not like his son, skilful in elaborate statements; nor like Fox, an exhaustive debater; nor like Burke, a profound philosopher; nor like Canning, a great master of sparkling fancy and

¹ Thackeray's *Life of Chatham*, i. 293.

of playful sarcasm; but he far surpassed them all in the blasting fury of his invective, in the force, fire, and majesty of a declamation which thrilled and awed the most fastidious audience, in the burning and piercing power with which he could imprint his views upon the minds of his hearers. Like most men of real and original genius, but unlike the great majority even of very eminent speakers, his eloquence did not consist solely or mainly in the skilful structure and the rhetorical collocation of his sentences. It abounded in noble thoughts nobly expressed, in almost rhythmical phrases of imaginative beauty which clung like poetry to the memory, in picturesque images and vivid epithets which illumined with a sudden gleam the subjects he treated. He lived at a time when there were no regular parliamentary reporters, he never appears to have himself corrected a speech, the remains we possess are but disjointed fragments or palpably inaccurate recollections, and nearly a hundred years have elapsed since his death; but yet, in spite of all these disadvantages, there are few English orators who have left so many passages or sentences or turns of phraseology which are still remembered. His comparison of the coalition of Fox and Newcastle to the junction of the Rhone and of the Saône, his denunciation of the employment of Indians in warfare, his defence of the Dissenters against the charge of secret ambition, his appeal to the historical memories recorded on the tapestry of the House of Lords, his contrast between the iron barons of the past and the silken barons of the present, his eulogy of Magna Charta, his expansion of the trite maxim that every Englishman's house is his castle, his descriptions of the Church of England as 'a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy,' and of the Press as 'like the air, a chartered libertine,' are all familiar, while hardly a sentence is remembered from the oratory of his son, of Fox, of Plunket, or of

Brougham. He possessed every personal advantage that an orator could desire—a singularly graceful and imposing form, a voice of wonderful compass and melody, which he modulated with consummate skill; an eye of such piercing brightness and such commanding power that it gave an air of inspiration to his speaking, and added a peculiar terror to his invective. The weight and dignity of a great character and a great intellect appeared in all he said, and a certain sustained loftiness of diction and of manner kept him continually on a higher level than his audience, and imposed respect upon the most petulant opposition.

In the histrionic part of oratory, in the power of conveying deep impressions by gesture, look, or tone, he appears indeed to have been unequalled among orators. Probably the greatest actor who ever lived was his contemporary, and the most critical and at the same time hostile observers declared that in grace and dignity of gesture Chatham was not inferior to Garrick. But notwithstanding the exquisitely finished acting displayed in their delivery, his speeches exhibited in the highest perfection that quality of spontaneity which so broadly distinguishes the best modern speaking from the prepared harangues of antiquity. They were scarcely ever of the nature of formal orations, and they were little governed by rule, symmetry, or method. They usually took the tone of a singularly elevated, rapid, and easy conversation, following the course of the debate, passing with unforced transitions, and with the utmost variety of voice and manner, through all the modes of statement, argument, sarcasm, and invective; abounding in ingenious illustrations and in unlooked-for flashes, digressing readily to answer objections or to resent interruption, and rising in a moment under the influence of a strong passion or of a great theme into the grandest and most majestic declamation. In his best days he used to speak

for hours with a power that never flagged, but in his latter years his voice often sank, whole passages were scarcely audible to the listeners, and his eloquence shone with a fitful and occasional, though still a dazzling splendour. 'He was not,' it was said,¹ 'like Townshend, for ever on the rack of exertion, but rather lightened upon his subject and reached the point by the flashings of his mind, which, like those of his eye, were felt but could not be followed.' He rarely involved himself in intricate or abstract speculation, or in long trains of reasoning; but no one was a greater master of those brief, keen arguments which are most effective in debate. No one could expose a fallacy with a more trenchant and epigrammatic clearness, or could illuminate his case with a more intense vividness. He is said to have cared less for the right of reply than most great speakers, but two of his most powerful speeches—his detailed refutation of Grenville's argument in favour of American taxation in 1766, and his answer in 1777 to Lord Suffolk's apology for the employment of Indians in war—were replies.

It was said by an acute critic² that both his son and Charles Fox often delivered abler speeches, but that neither of them ever attained those moments of transcendent greatness which were frequent with the elder Pitt, and that he alone of the three had the power not only of delighting and astonishing, but also of overawing the House. He had a grandeur and a manner peculiarly his own, and it was the pre-eminent characteristic of his eloquence that it impressed every hearer with the conviction that there was something in the speaker immeasurably greater even than his words. He delighted in touching the moral chords, in appealing to strong passions, in arguing questions on high grounds

¹ Grattan.

² Charles Butler.

of principle rather than on grounds of detail. As Grattan said, 'Great subjects, great empires, great characters, effulgent ideas, and classical illustrations, formed the material of his speeches.' His imagination was so vivid that he was accustomed to say that most things returned to him with greater force the second time than the first. His diction, though often rising to an admirable poetic beauty, was in general remarkably simple, and his speeches were so little prepared and so little restrained that he feared to speak when he had any important secret relating to the subject of debate on his mind. As he himself said, 'When my mind is full of a subject, if once I get on my legs it is sure to run over.' In the words of Walpole, 'though no man knew so well how to say what he pleased, no man ever knew so little what he was going to say.' But yet, as is often the case, this facility of spontaneous and sudden eloquence was only acquired by long labour, and it was probably compatible with a careful preparation of particular passages in his speeches. Wilkes described him as having given all his mind 'to the studying of words and rounding of sentences.' He had perused Barrow's sermons as a model of style, with such assiduity that he could repeat some of them by heart. He told a friend that he had read over Bailey's English Dictionary twice from beginning to end. He was one of the first to detect the great merit of the style of Junius as a model for oratory, and he recommended some early letters, which that writer had published under the signature of Domitian, to the careful study of his son. One who knew him well¹ described him as so fastidious that he disliked even to look upon a bad print, lest it should impair the delicacy of his taste.

Yet in truth that taste was far from pure, and there

¹ Lord Shelburne.

was much in his speeches that was florid and meretricious, and not a little that would have appeared absurd bombast but for the amazing power of his delivery, and the almost magnetic fascination of his presence. The anecdotes preserved of the ascendancy he acquired, and of the terror he inspired in the great councils of the realm, are so wonderful, and indeed so unparalleled, that they would be incredible were they not most abundantly attested. ‘The terrible,’ said Charles Butler, ‘was his peculiar power; then the whole House sank before him.’ ‘His words,’ said Lord Lyttelton, ‘have sometimes frozen my young blood into stagnation, and sometimes made it pace in such a hurry through my veins that I could scarce support it.’ ‘No malefactor under the stripes of an executioner,’ said Glover, ‘was ever more forlorn and helpless than Fox appeared under the lash of Pitt’s eloquence, shrewd and able in Parliament as Fox confessedly is.’ Fox himself, in one of his letters, describes a debate on a contested election, in which the member, who was accused of bribery, carried with him all the sympathies of the House, and kept it in a continual roar of laughter by a speech full of wit, humour, and buffoonery. ‘Mr. Pitt came down from the gallery and took it up in his highest tone of dignity. “He was astonished when he heard what had been the occasion of their mirth. Was the dignity of the House of Commons on such sure foundations that they might venture themselves to shake it? Had it not on the contrary been diminishing for years, till now we are brought to the very brink of a precipice, when, if ever, a stand must be made?” Then followed high compliments to the Speaker, eloquent exhortations to Whigs of all conditions to defend their attacked and expiring liberty, “unless you will degenerate into a little assembly, serving no other purpose than to register the arbitrary edicts of one too powerful a subject.” . . . Displeased as well as pleased allow it to be

the finest speech that was ever made ; and it was observed that by his first two periods he brought the House to a silence and attention that you might have heard a pin drop.'

On two occasions a member who attempted to answer him was so disconcerted by his glance, or by a few fierce words which he uttered, that he sat down confused and paralysed with fear. Charles Butler asked a member who was present on one of these occasions 'if the House did not laugh at the ridiculous figure of the poor member?' 'No, sir,' he replied, 'we were all too much awed to laugh.' No speaker ever took greater liberties with his audience. Thus, when George Grenville in one of his speeches was urging in defence of a tax the difficulty of discovering a substitute: 'Tell me where it should be placed ; I say, tell me where?' he was interrupted by Pitt humming aloud the refrain of a popular song, 'Tell me, gentle shepherd, where?' 'If, gentlemen, . . .' began Grenville, when Pitt rose, bowed, and walked contemptuously out of the House. 'Sugar, Mr. Speaker,' he once began, when a laugh arose. 'Sugar,' he repeated three times, turning fiercely round, 'who will now dare to laugh at sugar?' and the members, like timid schoolboys, sank into silence. 'On one occasion,' wrote Grattan—who, when a young man, carefully followed his speeches—'on addressing Lord Mansfield, he said, "Who are the evil advisers of his Majesty? is it you? is it you? is it you?" (pointing to the ministers until he came near Lord Mansfield). There were several lords round him, and Lord Chatham said, "My Lords, please to take your seats." When they sat down he pointed to Lord Mansfield, and said, "Is it you? Methinks Felix trembles."' Grattan adds, with much truth, 'It required a great actor to do this. Done by anyone else it would have been miserable. . . . It was said he was too much of a mountebank, but if so it was a great mountebank. Perhaps he was not so good

a debater as his son, but he was a much better orator, a greater scholar, and a far greater man.'¹

It is manifest that while his eloquence would have placed him first, or among the first of orators in any age or in any country, his usual style of speaking was only adapted to a period when regular reporters were unknown. Parliamentary reporting has immeasurably extended the influence of parliamentary speaking, it has done much to moderate its tone and to purify it from extravagance and bombast, but it is extremely injurious to its oratorical character. The histrionic part of eloquence has almost lost its power. A great speaker knows that it is necessary to emasculate his statements by cautions, limitations, and qualifications wholly unnecessary for the audience he addresses, but very essential if his words are to be perpetuated, and to be canvassed by the great public beyond the walls. He knows that language which would exercise a thrilling effect upon a heated assembly in the fierce excitement of a midnight debate would appear insufferably turgid and exaggerated if submitted the next day to the cold criticism of unimpassioned readers, and the mere fact that while addressing one audience he is thinking of another, gives an air of unreality to his speaking. In the time of Pitt, however, reporting was irregular, fitful, and inaccurate. The real aim of the great orator was to move the audience before him; but a vague report of the immense power of his speeches was communicated to the country; and detached passages or phrases,

¹ See an admirable letter on Pitt's speaking, in Grattan's *Life*. Grattan's Character of Pitt, *Miscellaneous Works*, pp. 9, 10. Butler's *Reminiscences*, i. 139-156. Thackeray's *Life of Chatham*. Almon's *Anecdotes of Chatham*. Glover's *Memoirs*.

Lord Waldegrave's *Memoirs*. Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.*, and the autobiography in the first volume of Lord E. Fitzmaurice's *Life of Shelburne*. This last book has thrown a good deal of additional light upon the elder Pitt.

eminently fitted to stir the passions of the people, were circulated abroad.

If we pass from the oratory of Pitt to his character, we must speak with much more qualification. His faults were, indeed, many and very grave, but they were redeemed by some splendid qualities which dazzled his contemporaries, and have perhaps exercised a somewhat disproportionate influence upon the judgments of posterity. He was entirely free from all taint or suspicion of corruption. Entering public life at a time when the standard of political honour was extremely low, having, it is said, at first a private fortune of not more than 100*l.* a year, and being at the same time almost destitute of parliamentary connection, conscious of the possession of great administrative powers, and intensely desirous of office, he exhibited in all matters connected with money the most transparent and fastidious purity. He once spoke of 'that sense of honour which makes ambition virtue,' and he illustrated it admirably himself. He was entirely inaccessible to corrupt offers, and, unlike the great majority of his contemporaries, not content with declaiming when in opposition, he attested in the most emphatic manner his sincerity when in power. On his appointment as Paymaster of the Forces, in 1746, he at once and for ever established his character by two striking instances of magnanimity. His predecessors had long been accustomed to invest in Government securities the large floating balance which was left in their hands for the payment of the troops and to appropriate the interest, and also to receive as a perquisite of office one-half per cent. of all subsidies voted by Parliament to foreign princes. These two sources of emolument being united to the regular salary of the office made it in time of war extremely lucrative; and though they had never been legalised they were universally recognised, and had been received without question and

without opposition by a long line of distinguished statesmen. Pitt, who was probably the poorest man who had ever filled the office, refused them as illegal, and when the King of Sardinia pressed upon him as a free gift a sum equivalent to the usual deduction from his subsidy, he at once declined to accept it.

Such a course speedily made him the idol of the nation, which had long chafed bitterly under the corruption of its representatives. Pitt had, indeed, every quality that was required for a great popular leader. His splendid eloquence, his disinterestedness, his position outside the charmed circle of aristocratic connections, the popular cast and tendency of his politics, filled the people with admiration, and their enthusiasm was by no means diminished by the pride with which, relying on their favour, he encountered every aristocratic cabal, or by the insatiable ambition which was the most conspicuous element of his character. His pride was indeed of that kind which is the guardian of many virtues, and his ambition was indissolubly linked with the greatness of his country. Beyond all other statesmen of the eighteenth century he understood and sympathised with the feelings of the English people, and recognised the great unrepresented forces of the nation, and amid all the variations of his career his love of freedom never faltered, and a burning, passionate patriotism remained the guiding principle of his life.

The qualities of a great popular leader are, however, by no means his only title to our admiration. It is his peculiar merit that, while no statesman of his time rested more entirely upon popular favour, or enjoyed it more largely, or valued it more highly, very few risked it so boldly in a righteous cause. Perhaps the very noblest incident of his life was his strenuous though unavailing opposition to the execution of Byng, at a time when popular excitement was running most fiercely

against the unhappy admiral, and when the King fully shared the feelings of his people. The moment was one of the most critical in the career of Pitt. The Devonshire Ministry had but just come into power. It was miserably weak in parliamentary influence. The King disliked it, and the favour of the people was its only support. No man had by nature less sympathy than Pitt with excessive caution or timidity. Yet he clearly saw that the execution of Byng was cruel, impolitic, and even unjust, and he risked the ruin of his popularity rather than support it.

He exhibited a similar courage more than once at a later period. When at the beginning of the next reign the opponents of Bute had lashed to fury the popular prejudice against the Scotch, Pitt, though himself the most formidable adversary of the Scotch favourite, never lost an opportunity of rebuking this prejudice with the sternest and most eloquent indignation. When Wilkes had become the idol of the multitude, Pitt, at the very time when he was exerting all his powers to defend the constitutional right of the popular hero to sit in Parliament, scornfully disclaimed all sympathy with him, describing him as ‘a blasphemer of his God, and a libeller of his King.’ When the Americans, defending the principles of liberty, had broken into open rebellion, Pitt defied the whole national feeling of England by exclaiming in Parliament, ‘I rejoice that America has resisted—three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest.’

Great disinterestedness, great courage, and great patriotism, united with an intense love of liberty, with splendid talents, and with splendid success, were sufficient to overbalance and sometimes to conceal faults that would have ruined an inferior man. No impartial

judge, indeed, who considers the career of Pitt, can fail to admit that it was disfigured by the grossest inconsistencies, and was in some of its parts distinctly dishonourable. He was a younger son of a family which had acquired considerable wealth in India—chiefly by the sale of the largest diamond then known ; and which, though not noble, was connected by marriage with the Stanhopes, and counted among its property the borough of Old Sarum. At Eton and Oxford he formed intimacies with many men who afterwards had high positions in politics. He travelled for a time in France and Italy, obtained on his return a cornetcy in a regiment of dragoons, and entered Parliament for Old Sarum in 1735, being then about twenty-seven. He at once attached himself to the Prince of Wales, who was in violent opposition to his father and to the Government, and became one of the most impetuous assailants of Walpole. He was one of the fiercest of that mischievous band who, by their furious declamations, drove the country into the Spanish war, frustrated all the pacific efforts of Walpole, and clamoured for a complete abandonment of the right of search as an indispensable condition of peace. He swelled the cry against standing armies in time of peace. He denounced the Hanoverian tendencies of Walpole ; he made that great minister the object of his constant invectives. Walpole is said to have exclaimed, on hearing him, ‘ We must muzzle this terrible cornet,’ and he deprived him of his commission ; but the Prince of Wales at once appointed him groom of his bedchamber. Upon the resignation of Walpole, Pitt distinguished himself beyond most other politicians by his implacable hostility to the fallen statesman, by the pertinacity with which he urged on his impeachment, and by the energy with which he supported the Bill for granting an indemnity to all who would give evidence against him.

The speedy result of the fall of Walpole was the ascendancy of Carteret. Pitt appeared as far as ever from power, and the King already looked upon him with especial dislike. The Hanoverian measures of Carteret, and especially the subsidising of Hanoverian troops, were extremely unpopular; and Pitt immediately constituted himself the organ of the popular feeling, and delivered, in 1743 and 1744, some of his most powerful speeches in opposition to the new favourite. He nicknamed him 'the Hanover-troop minister,' and his Government 'the prerogative administration.' He described him as 'a sole, an execrable minister, who seems to have drunk of the potion which poets have described as causing men to forget their country.' Comparing him to Walpole, he adduced the parallel of Rehoboam the son of Solomon, whose little finger was heavier than his predecessor's loins. He insulted the King in language which must appear shameful to all who do not consider a sovereign excluded from the ordinary courtesy of a gentleman, doubly shameful when viewed in the light of Pitt's own policy at a later period. 'It is now,' he exclaimed, 'but too apparent that this great, this powerful, this formidable kingdom, is considered only as a province to a despicable electorate.' He opposed the address to the King after the battle of Dettingen; he more than insinuated that the reports of the King's courage during the battle were untrue; he spoke of his 'absurd, ungrateful, and perfidious partiality for Hanover;' he declared that the public welfare demanded the separation of Hanover from England; he dilated upon the 'cowardice' of the Hanoverian troops, and upon the imaginary indignities offered to the British soldiers; and exaggerated with malignant eloquence every petty misconduct of the foreign allies. He objected to the whole scheme of the war, laying it down as a maxim 'that we should never assist our

allies upon the Continent with any great number of troops.’¹

His language at this time was certainly sufficiently violent and exaggerated. It must, however, be admitted that there were real and serious grounds for complaining that Carteret had subordinated the interests of England to those of Hanover. Much must be allowed for the excited condition of the nation, and something for that vehement oratorical temper which naturally leads a great speaker to magnify the evil of what his judgment pronounces to be censurable, and to express his opposition in the most powerful language. With the country these speeches made Pitt eminently popular, and in Parliament he was greatly feared; but by the leading statesmen he was not much liked or trusted. He was described as ‘extremely supercilious and apt to mingle passions with business;’ as ‘a young man of fine parts,’ but ‘narrow, not knowing much of the world, and a little too dogmatical.’² The old Duke of Newcastle, however, in a private letter to the Duke of Cumberland, not long after declared that Pitt had ‘the dignity of Sir W. Windham, the wit of Mr. Pulteney, and the knowledge and judgment of Sir R. Walpole.’

He soon, however, appeared in a very new light. He was extremely desirous of office, and it may be fairly admitted that this desire was due to no sordid motive, but to a consciousness of his extraordinary powers, and to a wish to devote them, in a period of great military decadence, to the service of the country. The Pelhams fully recognised his genius, and he speedily formed a close political alliance with them. This course was probably the only one which then opened to him a prospect of

¹ A curious collection of extracts from speeches of Pitt to this effect will be found in the *Quarterly Review*, vol. lxvi.

Life of Chatham.

² *Marchmont Papers*, i. 72, 74, 80.

political power, and it proved eventually of great benefit to the country ; but it must be acknowledged that there was something, at least singular, in the alliance of the orator who had denounced the whole policy of Walpole with the most unqualified violence, and who had continually thundered against the corruption of his administration, with Henry Pelham, who was universally regarded as the natural heir to the policy of Walpole, and with Newcastle, who had been the chief agent in the corruption of which Walpole had been accused. Be this, however, as it may ; the alliance was a very firm one, and was long faithfully observed. When the Pelhams constructed the 'Broad-bottomed Ministry' in December 1744, they admitted several of Pitt's friends to office, and would have made Pitt himself Secretary at War, but for the positive refusal of the King.¹ They undertook, however, ultimately to break down the royal opposition ; and on this understanding Pitt gave them his warm and unqualified support. He resigned his position in the household of the Prince of Wales. He had hitherto been the most vehement opponent of the system of carrying on the war by land, and had, as late as January 1743-4, made the policy of maintaining a British army in Flanders the special object of his attack ;² but he now rose from his sick bed, and came down to the House to deliver an eloquent speech in support of the Pelham project of strengthening and continuing that army. He had almost exhausted the vocabulary of abuse in denouncing Carteret for taking Hanoverian troops into British pay, but he now spoke in favour of the Pelham scheme of continuing that pay in an indirect form by increasing the subsidy of the Queen of Hungary on the understanding that she should

¹ Coxe's *Life of Pelham*, i. 197.

² See this speech in Thackeray's *Life of Chatham*, i. 129.

take the Hanoverians into her service.¹ Nor was this all. In 1746, without the smallest remonstrance from Pitt, the Hanoverians were again taken directly into British pay, and the measure for which one minister was driven with the intensest obloquy from office was quietly adopted by his successors.

The Pelhams were not ungrateful for this support. I have already described the events which placed Bath and Granville in power for forty-eight hours, and then led to the unconditional surrender of the King. The proximate cause of this change was the pertinacity with which Newcastle urged upon the King the claims of Pitt. The chief condition Newcastle exacted on returning to office was the appointment of Pitt—not, indeed, to the office of Secretary at War, but to that of Vice-Treasurer of Ireland, from which he was speedily promoted to that of Paymaster of the Forces. The admirable pecuniary disinterestedness he manifested in this office should not blind us to the glaring and almost grotesque inconsistency of his conduct. He who had done all in his power, not only to drive Walpole from office, but also to persecute him to death, was now a member of a Government consisting chiefly of Walpole's colleagues and following closely in Walpole's steps. He who had made Parliament ring with denunciations of the payment of Hanoverian troops now voted for a considerable increase of the Hanoverian subsidies. He who had contributed so largely to plunge the nation into war with Spain on account of the right of search, and had maintained that a British Government must at all hazards exact from the Spaniards a complete surrender of that right, now supported the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, which concluded the war without even mentioning the right of search. He who had made himself

¹ Coxe's *Life of Pelham*, i. 216.

the special organ of the popular antipathy to an army in time of peace now strenuously argued for the maintenance of the army when the war was terminated.

It is an extraordinary proof of the intellectual power of Pitt that he should have maintained his position unshaken when his career was in so many respects open to attack. It is, perhaps, a still more remarkable proof of the impression of honesty and sincerity which he left upon the minds of those who came in contact with him, that, in spite of all these fluctuations, he should have still preserved his moral ascendancy. No man, indeed, was more governed in his judgment by the vehement feelings of the moment, or cared less to reconcile the different parts of his career. When a member urged upon him the necessity of continuing the war till the right of search was surrendered, he simply said that 'he had once been an advocate for that claim. It was when he was a young man; but now he was ten years older, had considered public affairs more coolly, and was convinced that the claim of no search respecting British vessels near the coast of Spanish America could never be obtained unless Spain was so reduced as to consent to any terms her conquerors might think proper to impose.' His conversion to the expediency of armies in time of peace was attributed to the lesson furnished by the rebellion of 1745. His abandonment of all his old maxims about subsidising foreign troops or carrying on continental war he justified on the ground that circumstances had changed by the expulsion from office of the minister who was in German interests; and at a later period he urged that Hanover was endangered on account of England, or that Frederick was the most formidable adversary of France. After the death of Walpole he took occasion in one of his speeches to speak of that minister in terms of warm eulogy, and to express his regret for his own opposition to the Excise Scheme. In general he re-

fused to enter into explanations, and took a very lofty tone with all who ventured to hint at inconsistencies. 'The honourable member had quoted his words exactly, but mistook the meaning; which was not to give offence to a head so honourable and honest as his. He deprecated any invidious retrospect as to what had passed in former debates, and heartily wished all the differences they had occasioned might be buried in oblivion, and not revived again to the reproach of any gentleman whatever.'

He supported the Pelhams very steadily and very efficiently, and they cordially recognised his merits. 'I think him,' said Pelham in one of his letters, 'the most able and useful man we have amongst us; truly honourable and strictly honest. He is as firm a friend to us as we can wish for, and a more useful one there does not exist.' On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that he owed a debt of the deepest gratitude to these statesmen, and especially to Newcastle. When he was still young, poor, and isolated, they had taken him under their protection, had supported him with the whole weight of their unrivalled parliamentary influence, and had made it for years their steady object to overcome the antipathy of the King. Newcastle was not a brave man, but he had not hesitated for the sake of Pitt to incur the bitterest royal displeasure, and even to break up the ministry in the midst of the rebellion, in order to compel the King to admit Pitt to office. The King never forgave it; and whatever may have been the faults of Newcastle, he had a right to expect much gratitude from Pitt. Nor was Pitt so insensible to the value of royal favour as to be inclined to under-rate the service that was done to him. His language, indeed, when suffering under the displeasure of the King, was strangely abject and unmanly. 'Bearing long a load of obloquy for supporting the King's

measures,' he once wrote to Lord Hardwicke, 'and never obtaining in recompense the smallest remission of that displeasure I vainly laboured to soften, all ardour for public business is really extinguished in my mind. . . . The weight of irremovable royal displeasure is a load too great to move under; it must crush any man; it has sunk and broken me. I succumb, and wish for nothing but a decent and innocent retreat.'¹ On another occasion, when Newcastle had been endeavouring, as he often did, to soften the feelings of the King towards the young statesman, Pitt wrote: 'I cannot conclude without assuring your Grace of my warmest gratitude for the kind use you were so good as to make of some expressions in my letter; nothing can touch me so sensibly as any good office in that place where I deservedly stand in need of it so much, and where I have so much at heart to efface the past by every action of my life.'²

Such was the language of Pitt, such were his obligations to Newcastle, at a time when he was still struggling into power. How he requited those obligations after the death of Pelham, when Sir Thomas Robinson obtained the leadership of the House, has been already described. His conduct at this period of his career is often passed over much too lightly. It is no doubt true that the fierce conflict between Hardwicke and Fox at a time when they were both prominent ministers in the same Government sufficiently shows the imperfection of the discipline then prevailing in the administration; but, still, the conduct of a subordinate minister who, while retaining office, makes it his main object to discredit his official superiors, cannot be justified. And Pitt adopted this course through the mere spite of a disappointed place-hunter, and his hostility was directed

¹ *Chatham Correspondence*, i. 105.

² *Ibid.* i. 49.

against the statesman to whom, more than to any other single politician, he owed the success he had hitherto achieved. At the very time when he thus revolted against Newcastle, he was actually sitting in Parliament for one of the Pelham boroughs.¹ The excuses which have been made for him on the ground of the crude judgments and vehement passions of a young man, of the low standard of political morality, of the jealousies and fretfulness of Newcastle, or of the mismanagement of public affairs, can amount only to a palliation, not a justification, of his proceedings. Pitt was not a very young man when he came into Parliament; he was forty-six at the time of the death of Pelham; and his conduct exhibited far graver defects than mere violence, impatience, or inconsistency.

There were also faults of another description which greatly impaired his career. That nervous irritability which frequently accompanies great mental powers, and which the conflicts of Parliament are peculiarly fitted to aggravate, was in his case intensified by disease; and it reached a point which seemed sometimes hardly compatible with sanity. Canning, at a later period, exhibited a somewhat similar irritability; but the sensitiveness which in Canning was shown by acute suffering under attack, with Chatham assumed the form of an almost superhuman arrogance. His natural temperament, his consciousness of the possession of unrivalled powers, his contempt for the corrupt politicians about him, and his determination to make the voice of the people heard amid the intrigues of party, contributed to foster it. In debate his transcendent eloquence, and especially his powers of invective, enabled him in a great measure to crush opposition even when he could not win votes; but it was in the management of party

¹ Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* ii. 271.

that his fierce and ungovernable temper was most fatal to his career. 'His language,' as General Conway once said, 'was of a kind seldom heard west of Constantinople.' His imperious and dictatorial manners made him in his latter days of all politicians the most difficult to co-operate with, and contributed perhaps as much as the selfishness of the great families to the disunion of the Whigs.

He was at the same time singularly theatrical and affected. His speeches owed much of their charm to the most consummate acting, and he carried his histrionic turn into every sphere in which he moved. As Goldsmith said of Garrick, he never seemed natural except when acting. In his intercourse with his most intimate friends, in the most confidential transaction of business, he was always strained and formal, assuming postures, studying effects and expressions. His dress, his sling, his crutch, were all carefully arranged for the most private interview. His under-secretaries were never suffered to sit in his presence. His letters—whether he was addressing a minister on affairs of state, or exhorting his young nephew to guard against the ungracefulness of laughter¹—were tumid, formal, and affected. He told Lord Shelburne that, even independently of considerations of health, he would always, for reasons of policy, live a few miles out of town. He performed many acts that were very noble, but he seldom lost sight of the effect they might produce. He performed them with an elaborate ostentation; and simplicity, modesty, and unobtrusive excellence were wholly alien to his character. It is said of him that in his family circle he delighted in reading out the tragedies of Shakespeare, which he did with great pathos and power; but whenever he came

¹ *Chatham Correspondence*, i. 79. Chesterfield impressed the same precept upon his son.

to any light or comic parts, he immediately stopped and gave the book to some member of his family to read. This anecdote is characteristic of his whole life. He never unbent. He was always acting a part, always self-conscious, always aiming at a false and unreal dignity.

These faults increased with age. Success and admiration turned his head, and the seeds of a nervous disease that had a close affinity to insanity continually affected him. With all his brilliant qualities he was not one of those great men who retain the simplicity of their character in the most splendid positions, moving like the lights of heaven, undisturbed by the admiration of which they are the object. As his mind grew more and more disordered, he learnt to delight in an almost regal state, in pomp and ceremony and ostentation, in inflated language and florid imagery. Of all very great Englishmen, he is perhaps the one in whom there was the largest admixture of the qualities of a charlatan.

It was consistent with this disposition that he should have been singularly affected by royalty. He could, as we have seen, speak of the Sovereign in terms that may be justly designated as insolent, and during the greater part of life he was in opposition to the Court; but he could also adopt a tone of almost Oriental servility. Royalty is surrounded by associations that appeal so powerfully to the imagination that it exercises some dazzling influence on most of those who are brought for the first time in contact with it; but the power it seems to have had over such a man as Chatham, after years of greatness and of office, is both humiliating and strange. I have already quoted some sentences from his letters on the subject, and others scarcely less abject might be cited. 'The least peep into that closet,' Burke complained, 'intoxicates him, and will to the end of his life.'

‘At the levee,’ said another observer, ‘he used to bow so low you could see the tip of his hooked nose between his legs.’ When he retired from office in 1761, in the very zenith of his fame, a few kind and unexpected words from George III. so overcame him that he burst into tears.

He was, no doubt, an eminently patriotic man, essentially disinterested, and free from all tendency to avarice, but even in this respect he was accustomed to take a tone of superiority which was not altogether justified by his life. He began his public career a very poor man, and he never stooped, like most of his contemporaries, to corruption; but no one who follows his course under George II. will regard him as having been indifferent to office; he was in fact nearly always in place either under the Crown or in the household of the Prince of Wales, and by a singular felicity he was no loser by his short periods of opposition. The Duchess of Marlborough was so pleased with his attacks upon Walpole and Carteret that she bequeathed him 10,000*l.* in 1744. His brother-in-law, Lord Temple, extricated him from difficulty when he was dismissed from office in 1755, by a gift of 1,000*l.* He obtained a legacy of 1,000*l.* from Mr. Allen, one of his admirers, in 1764; and in the following year Sir William Pynsent, who was wholly unknown to him, left him an estate of the annual value of 3,000*l.* Under George II. he stood proudly and somewhat ostentatiously aloof from the whole department of patronage, but he at least acquiesced very placidly in the corruption of his colleagues. In the following reign he accepted a fair share of the dignities and emoluments of the Crown—a peerage for his wife, a pension of 3,000*l.* a year, and at a later period an earldom for himself. None of these rewards were dishonourably acquired; all of them were amply deserved; but it is absurd to speak of such a career as a miracle

of self-denial. Both the elder and the younger Pitt delighted in a kind of ostentatious virtue which raised them, in the eyes of careless observers, to a far higher level than politicians like Burke or like Fox, who, with abilities perhaps not inferior, sacrificed incomparably more to their principles.¹

But yet with all his faults he was a very great man—far surpassing both in mental and moral altitude the other politicians of his generation. As a war minister his greatness was beyond question, and almost beyond comparison. At very few periods of English history was the aspect of affairs more gloomy than at the beginning of the second ministry of Pitt. The country seemed hopelessly overmatched; the public services had fallen into anarchy or decrepitude, and a general languor and timidity had overspread all departments. The wild panic that had lately passed through England upon the rumour of an invasion showed how little confidence she felt in her security, while the loss of Minorca had discredited her in the eyes of the world, and annihilated both her commerce with the Levant and her supremacy in the Mediterranean. In America, General Loudon, with a large force, made an expedition in July 1757 against Louisburg; but it was conducted with great timidity and hesitation, and on the arrival of a French fleet was somewhat ignominiously abandoned, while the French carried on the war with energy and success upon the borders of Lake George. In spite of English cruisers they succeeded in the beginning of 1757 in pouring reinforcements into Canada, while French squadrons swept the sea around the West Indies and the coasts of Africa. Nearer home an expedition against Rochefort, which was one of the first enterprises

¹ See the very remarkable statements of Lord Shelburne in his *Autobiography*, pp. 75, 76.

of Pitt, failed through the irresolution of Sir John Mordaunt. On the Continent the league against Frederick and against Hanover seemed overwhelming, and it appeared as if the struggle could not be greatly prolonged. Before the end of March 1757, two French armies, amounting together to 100,000 men, were in the field. They soon occupied the Duchy of Cleves, and marched rapidly on Hanover. Frederick withdrew his garrisons from the invaded country, and left the defence of Germany to the Duke of Cumberland, who hastened over in April to defend Hanover with a mixed army of about 60,000 men, consisting almost entirely of different bodies of German mercenaries, while Frederick himself marched against Bohemia. He calculated that in a few months a great Russian army would be in the field against him; that his only chance of safety was to strike down the Austrians while they were still isolated, and that in the meantime the Duke of Cumberland might hold the French at bay. On May 5 he crossed the Moldau, and on the 6th he fought the great battle of Prague, one of the most bloody in the eighteenth century. It lasted for twelve hours, and although the victory remained with Frederick, he acknowledged that he had left 18,000 men on the field. Marshal Browne, who commanded the Austrians, was killed, and the losses of the Austrian army were computed at 24,000. Prague was speedily besieged, but on June 18 another great battle was fought at Kolin, which decided the campaign. The Austrians under Marshal Daun greatly surpassed the Prussians in numbers. They occupied a position of extraordinary strength, and after desperate efforts to dislodge them, the Prussians were driven back with the loss of about 14,000 men, and of many cannon. They were compelled to abandon the siege of Prague, and the shattered remains of a once mighty army hastily evacuated

Bohemia and returned to Saxony. The Russians speedily advanced upon East Prussia, took Memel, and desolated the surrounding country. General Lehwald, with an army of less than a third of their number, attacked them on August 30, but after a fierce combat he was driven back ; but the Russians suffered so much in the action that they retired for a time from the Prussian dominion, while General Lehwald succeeded in expelling the Swedes, who were desolating Pomerania.

On the side of Hanover the war was altogether unfortunate. The Duke of Cumberland, on July 26, was completely defeated by the French in the battle of Hastenbeck, on the Weser. Hanover was speedily overrun, occupied, and pillaged ; and on September 8, by the mediation of the King of Denmark, the Convention of Closterseven was concluded, by which Cumberland agreed to send home to their respective countries the subsidised troops from Hesse, Brunswick, and Saxe-Gotha, while part of the Hanoverian army took shelter in the town of Stade, and the remainder retired beyond the Elbe, leaving Hanover in the full possession of the French, who were now free to turn their arms to any part of the Prussian dominions. Only a few weeks before, the news arrived that Ostend and Nieuport, so long regarded as among the most important barriers against the encroachments of France, had, by the invitation of her Imperial Majesty, received French garrisons.¹

It is not clear that Cumberland could have taken any better step. His army was outnumbered, ill-disciplined, heterogeneous, and defeated ; and if the French had at this time exhibited anything of the energy and military talent which they displayed so abundantly in the days of Lewis XIV., and which they again showed

¹ *Chatham Correspondence*, i. 248.

in the days of Napoleon, they might easily have compelled it to surrender at discretion. In Prussia, however, the Convention was denounced as the most infamous of desertions, and in England the indignation it excited was scarcely less. The unfortunate commander, on his return, was overwhelmed with obloquy. The King received him with a cutting silence. 'Here is my son,' he afterwards said to the courtiers who surrounded him, 'who has ruined me and disgraced himself.' Cumberland at once threw up all his military employments, and thus closed a career which had been singularly unfortunate. Of all the members of the royal family, with the exception of Queen Caroline, he was the only one who possessed any remarkable ability, and Horace Walpole even placed him in this respect, somewhat absurdly, in the same category with Sir R. Walpole, Granville, Mansfield, and Pitt.¹ He was noted, too, for a rugged truthfulness, for a conscientious energy of administration, for an uncomplaining loyalty, for a fidelity to his friends and engagements not common among the great personages of his time. For a few weeks after the battle of Culloden he had been the idol of the nation, and in allusion to his name, 'the sweet William' became the favourite flower of loyal Englishmen, but the accounts of the atrocities that followed his triumph soon turned the stream; and his harsh, morose, and arbitrary temper, the exaggerated sternness of his military discipline, and the steady hatred of the Scotch, made him, somewhat undeservedly, one of the most unpopular men in England. In the Regency Bill, which followed the death of the Prince of Wales, he was deprived of the first place which would naturally have devolved on him. His one victory brought with it recollections more bitter than many defeats, and he was

¹ Walpole's *George II.* iii. 85.

associated in the popular mind with the disasters of Fontenoy, Lauffeld, Hastenbeck, and Closterseven. Pitt, whom he had constantly opposed, and in whose dismissal he had borne a great part, acted on this occasion very nobly, and when the angry King urged that he had given his son no order for such a treaty, rejoined, 'But full powers, sir; very full powers.' The cloud that hung over the unhappy prince was never wholly removed, and he died in the prime of life in 1765.

It is not surprising that, under the circumstances I have described, the position of affairs should have appeared almost hopeless. No English statesman had studied foreign politics more carefully than Chesterfield, and his judgment was forcibly expressed in a private letter written about this time. 'Whoever is in,' he wrote, 'or whoever is out, I am sure we are undone both at home and abroad. At home, by our increasing debt and expenses; abroad, by our ill luck and incapacity. The King of Prussia, the only ally we had in the world, is now, I fear, *hors de combat*. Hanover I look upon to be by this time in the same situation with Saxony, the fatal consequence of which is but too obvious. The French are masters to do what they please in America. We are no longer a nation. I never yet saw so dreadful a prospect.'¹ The language of Pitt was scarcely less desponding. 'The day is come,' he wrote in one of his most confidential despatches, 'when the very inadequate benefits of the Treaty of Utrecht, the indelible reproach of the last generation, are become the necessary but almost unattainable wish of the present, when the Empire is no more, the ports of the Netherlands betrayed, the Dutch Barrier Treaty an empty sound, Minorca, and with it the Mediterranean,

¹ July 1757. Chesterfield's *Miscellaneous Works*, iv. 198.

lost, and America itself precarious.'¹ So serious did the situation appear, that he even endeavoured, though without success, to induce Spain to draw the sword against France, by the promise that if Spanish assistance enabled England to recover Minorca, England would cede Gibraltar to the Spanish king.²

Pitt had, however, just confidence in himself. 'I am sure,' he said on one occasion to the Duke of Devonshire, 'that I can save the country, and that no one else can.'³ If he did not possess to a high degree the skill of a great strategist in detecting the vulnerable parts of his opponents and in mapping out brilliant campaigns, he had at least an eagle eye for discovering talent and resolution among his subordinates, a rare power of restoring the vigour of every branch of administration, and, above all, a capacity unrivalled among statesmen of reviving the confidence and the patriotism of the nation, and of infusing an heroic daring into all who served him. 'No man,' said Colonel Barré, 'ever entered his closet who did not come out of it a braver man.' He came into power at the end of June 1757, and disasters, largely due to the incapacity of his predecessors, and especially to the long period of administrative anarchy that had just taken place, threw a deep shade over the first months of his power. The news of the defeat of Frederick, of the introduction of French troops into the Austrian Netherlands, of the battle of Hastenbeck, of the Convention of Closterseven, and of the failure before Louisburg, followed in swift succession. The expedition against Rochefort was skilfully planned. The energy with which a large fleet and a considerable army were equipped was of good omen,

Pitt's
war
Talent

¹ To Sir Benjamin Keene, Aug. 1757. *Chatham Correspondence*, i. 251.

² *Chatham Correspondence*, i.

247-256.

³ Thackeray's *Life of Chatham*, i. 318.

and the mere fact that England once more took the offensive had some moral effect; but the expedition, as I have said, failed through the timidity of its commander, or at least it succeeded only in destroying the fortifications of the little island of Aix. An Act organising a national militia, which had long been a popular demand and a favourite project of Pitt, had been carried chiefly by the exertions of George Townshend, just before the accession of Pitt to power, but it was an extremely ominous sign that it produced the most violent discontent. Notwithstanding the critical condition of affairs, great numbers of the country gentry and farmers resented the duties thrown on them. The people believed that by serving in the militia they became liable to foreign service, and the first months of the administration of Pitt were disturbed by violent riots in Surrey, Kent, Leicester, Hertford, Bedford, Nottingham, and Yorkshire. The towns speedily caught the martial enthusiasm which Pitt sought to inspire, but the country districts were at first torpid or hostile, and regular troops had to be employed in the midst of the war to compel the people to serve in that very constitutional force for which they had long been clamouring as the best defence against standing armies.¹

It was from Prussia that the first gleam of good fortune shone upon the cause. That unhappy country was now placed under the ban of the German Empire, and invaded simultaneously in different quarters by the French, the Russians, the Austrians, and the Swedes. Silesia was again in the power of the Austrians as far as Breslau, which surrendered, in November, without a blow. They had made themselves masters of Zittau in Lusatia, and in October an Austrian detachment had even laid Berlin under contribution, while the occupa-

¹ Walpole's *Memoirs of George II.* iii. 40-42. *Chatham Correspondence*, i. 257-262.

tion of Hanover, and the surrender of Cumberland, had opened a long frontier line to the invasions of the French, and for a time deprived Prussia of all assistance on the Continent. But the little State which was thus struggling in the grasp of so many and such mighty antagonists, found in the agony of her fate resources in herself of which her enemies had scarcely dreamed. Her assailants were fighting only for ambition, but Prussia was fighting a desperate fight for her very existence. She had long been administered like a great camp. Her army, in proportion to her population, was enormous, and it had been brought by the Draconic discipline of two reigns to the highest point of efficiency. Her King was now incomparably the greatest general in Europe, and he had the immense advantage of not only commanding the armies, but also disposing absolutely of the resources of the State, while among his opponents discipline was relaxed, the whole army administration had gone to decay, and except in the Austrian army there was an almost entire absence of military ability. After several skirmishes in different parts of the Prussian territory, the King, at the head of an army of not more than 25,000 men, utterly routed nearly 40,000 French and nearly 20,000 German troops, at Rossbach, on November 5, 1757. 3,000 of the enemy were left on the field; nearly 7,000 men, more than sixty cannon, and many flags were taken; while the whole Prussian loss was about 500 men. A month later Frederick was found in Silesia at the head of an army of 30,000 or 40,000 men, and at Leuthen he fought a decisive battle with a great Austrian army commanded by Prince Charles of Lorraine. The disproportion of numbers was almost if not altogether as great as at Rossbach, and the Austrian army was better disciplined and better commanded than the French, but the victory of the Prussians was complete and overwhelming: at

least 22,000 Austrians were left on the field or taken prisoners, and the remainder, with the loss of a multitude of cannon and flags, were driven in disorder out of the Prussian dominions. Before the Prussians retired into winter quarters, Breslau, with 17,000 Austrian soldiers, was compelled to surrender, and all Silesia was for a time under Prussian rule.

At these successes the spirit of the nation rose very high, and, as is ever the case, the consciousness of the presence of a great general gave a new courage and confidence to his troops, and infused a proportionate despondency into his enemies. But the struggle would have been a hopeless one but for the assistance of Pitt. The Convention of Closterseven had been ratified on neither side. It had not been rigidly observed by the French, there were no stipulations for the duration of the neutrality of the Hanoverians, and it might on the whole be reasonably regarded as a mere temporary armistice. Pitt recommended to repudiate it.¹ The Hanoverian army was armed anew. The command was given to Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, one of the best generals in the Prussian service. It was soon after reinforced by 12,000 English under the Duke of Marlborough, and it bore a chief part in defending the side of Germany conterminous to France. Pitt, at the same time, disregarding all his former denunciations of German subsidies, obtained an annual subsidy of nearly 700,000*l.* for Frederick, which during the next few years was punctually paid. Had it not been for this succour, and for the immense supplies which Frederick contrived with a vindictive pleasure to wring from the unhappy Saxons, the material resources of Prussia would probably have been wholly inadequate to the strain of the war.

¹ The text of the Convention and also the arguments of the English when repudiating it are given in full by Smollett.

At the same time, undeterred by the failure of the Rochefort expedition, Pitt pressed on eagerly his attacks on the French coast. It is this part of his military policy that has been most blamed, and it must be owned that no material results were obtained commensurate with the cost of life and money incurred, but they kept large bodies of French troops in their own country. The moral effect of these numerous attacks on a nation peculiarly susceptible of sudden panic was very considerable. In the course of 1758 an attempt of the French to send reinforcements to America from Aix was defeated by Hawke. A powerful expedition of ships and soldiers was sent against St. Malo, but it resulted only in the destruction of some French shipping. Cherbourg was attacked and occupied, its docks were destroyed, its shipping was burnt; but this success was speedily counterbalanced by a disaster which befell some British troops who had landed at St. Cas, and who were surprised and driven off with great loss. In the following year, when some preparations were made for an invasion of England, Havre was bombarded and very seriously injured by Rodney.

The German campaign of 1758 was marked by great vicissitudes of fortune. The part which was taken by Frederick began with an invasion of Moravia, and an attempt to take Olmutz, which was defeated by the skilful strategy of Marshal Daun, who succeeded in cutting off the supplies of the Prussian army. After some inconsiderable movements, Frederick then turned his arms against the Russians, who, having invaded Pomerania and the marches of Brandenburg in great force, had penetrated nearly as far as Frankfort on the Oder, committing the most frightful atrocities on their way. The great battle of Zorndorf, which began on the 25th of August, and continued more or less during the two following days, determined the campaign. More

than 21,000 Russians, more than 11,000 Prussians, were left on the field, and the Russian army was compelled to retreat. The victor then, leaving a small body of troops to watch the frontier, turned his rapid steps to Saxony, which Marshal Daun, after the raising of the siege of Olmutz, had hastened to relieve. The plan of the Austrians was to avail themselves of the absence of Frederick in Pomerania to invade simultaneously Silesia and Saxony, and it appeared almost certain that one or both would be withdrawn from the Prussian grasp. The chief efforts of the Austrians were made in Saxony. The small Prussian army there was completely outnumbered. General Maguire, one of the many Irish officers in the Austrian service, succeeded on September 5 in capturing after a short resistance the important fortress of Sonnenstein, overlooking Pirna, and there was much reason to believe that Dresden would soon be rescued. But Frederick, who, like Napoleon, was accustomed to disconcert his enemies not more by his strategy in the field than by the extraordinary and in his own day unparalleled rapidity of his marches, speedily arrived at the Saxon frontier, and reduced the enemy to the defensive. Here, however, for a time his good fortune deserted him. The skilful Austrian general, who had already baffled him at Kolin and at Olmutz, but whose extreme caution and excessive slowness had hitherto prevented him from reaping the fruits of his success, succeeded in surprising the Prussian camp at Hochkirchen, on October 14, and in completely defeating the Prussian army. All the military skill of Frederick was required to prevent the defeat becoming an absolute rout, and it was one of the greatest faults of Daun that he gave Frederick time to repair it. The discipline, and in some degree the confidence, of the Prussian army were speedily restored, and Frederick acted with characteristic vigour. Evading

the army of Daun, and leaving Saxony for the present to its fate, he marched upon Neiss, a frontier town of Silesia, which an Austrian army was besieging, raised the siege, and obliged the Austrians to evacuate Silesia and to retire into Bohemia. In the meantime, Daun had besieged Dresden, which was courageously defended by a Prussian garrison, who held out till Frederick, with an army now completely refitted and reorganised, again appearing in Saxony, obliged Daun both to raise the siege and to cross the frontier.

The army of Prince Ferdinand had in the meantime driven the French from Hanover and across the Rhine, and although the English contingent had not yet arrived, it had defeated the French with much loss on June 23, in the battle of Crefeld. The French, however, having reached their own frontier, received powerful reinforcements, and after some weeks Prince Ferdinand recrossed the Rhine, baffling with great skill the efforts of the French to prevent him. In October the French gained a considerable success in Hesse, and the army of Prince Ferdinand was much wasted by illness. Among those who died was the Duke of Marlborough, who commanded the English.

In America events were taking place of far greater importance to England. In spite of the immense preponderance of numbers on the side of the English, the balance of success in the first years of the war had been clearly with the French. In Europe the administration and the enterprise of France had seldom sunk so low as during the Seven Years' War, but Montcalm and the little body of French colonists and soldiers whom he commanded in Canada, exhibited in rare perfection the high quality of French daring. The population of the French colony was so small that there were said to have been in all not more than 20,000 men capable of bearing arms, and as these were drawn for

the most part from agriculture, the utmost distress was prevailing. By skilful strategy, by availing themselves of powerful fortresses, by concentrating their slender resources on some single point, by the employment of Indian allies, and, it must be added, by the singular mismanagement and feebleness of their opponents, the French had hitherto more than held their own. But Pitt, on attaining to power, at once made it one of his main objects to drive them from America. He urgently appealed to the colonists to raise 20,000 men for the cause. The Crown was to provide arms, ammunition, tents, and provisions. The colonies were to raise, clothe, and pay the levies, but for this expense he promised a parliamentary reimbursement, and this promise induced the colonists to make all the efforts that were required. General Loudon, the English commander-in-chief, was recalled, and replaced by General Abercrombie. Disregarding all claims of mere seniority, and looking only for skill, courage, and enterprise, the minister placed Wolfe and Howe, who were still quite young men, and Amherst, who was but just forty, in important commands. A powerful fleet was sent out under the command of Boscawen for an attack upon Louisburg; the English had soon nearly 50,000 men under arms, and of these about 22,000 were regular troops, while the regular troops on the side of France were less than 5,000. Supplies were cut off by the fleet, and the French Government at home made scarcely a serious effort to support their colonists. Under such circumstances the war could have but one end. In 1758 Louisburg, with the whole of Cape Breton, was taken; and in another quarter Fort Duquesne, which had borne so great a part in the first events of the war, was compelled to surrender, but the French repulsed with great loss an English attack upon Ticonderoga, and Lord Howe lost his life in the battle. In 1759

Ticonderoga, Crown Point, and Niagara were captured in swift succession, and soon after, a desperate struggle in which both sides displayed splendid courage, and in which both Wolfe and Montcalm found a glorious end, planted the flag of England on the heights of Quebec. In 1760 the French gained one last victory at Sillery and even laid siege to Quebec, but they were soon obliged to retire; the conquest was completed by the surrender of Montreal, with the last French army; and the whole of Canada passed under the English rule.

No conquest during the war excited a wilder enthusiasm. In the eyes even of keen observers it had long appeared extremely doubtful whether England or France was destined to exercise political supremacy in the New World. The progress of the French power had been so rapid, and its organisation so skilful, that it had been steadily encroaching upon its rival. Yet, looking at the question in the calmer light of history, it can hardly, I think, be disputed that the danger was exaggerated. The immense difference in population between the French and English colonies made the ultimate ascendancy of the latter inevitable, and the same military character, which was the secret of the rapid successes of the French, prevented them from striking deep root in the soil, and from founding those great industrial communities which alone endure. But other consequences, unforeseen, but not less important, were pending; and already, amid the blaze of the victories of Pitt, that strange Nemesis which so often dogs the steps of great human prosperity may be clearly described. The destruction of the French power in America removed the one ever-pressing danger which secured the dependence of the English colonies on the mother country. The great colonial forces raised and successfully employed during the war gave the colonies for the

first time a consciousness of their strength, and furnished them with leaders for the War of Independence; while the burden of the debt due to the lavish expenditure of Pitt revived that scheme for the taxation of America which led in a few years to the dismemberment of the Empire.

The ascendancy of the English on the sea was soon complete, and it involved the most absolute destruction of the colonial empire of France. 60,000 seamen were voted for 1758, and a measure which was at this time carried for the more punctual payment of seamen's wages,¹ as well as the great number of prizes that were speedily taken, added immensely to the popularity of the service. Pitt pressed on every expedition with a calculated and sagacious audacity, and his imperious will broke down every obstacle. In the very first enterprise of his administration, Anson, startled at the rapidity required, declared that it was impossible to have the ships ready at the time that was specified. Pitt at once rejoined that in that case he would lay the matter before the King, and impeach the First Lord of the Admiralty in the House of Commons. The threat was sufficient, and the ships were ready at the appointed time. The Dutch, presuming on the weakness of previous governments in England, had largely assisted the French with naval stores, but Pitt promptly arrested this by an order that every Dutch vessel laden with naval or military stores should be at once captured, and after much angry remonstrance the Dutch were obliged to submit. Goree and Senegal, so valuable for the African trade, Guadeloupe, and the little island of Mariagalante were soon compelled to surrender. Hawke, Boscawen, and Pococke, in a succession of naval victories, captured or destroyed about nine-tenths of the

¹ See Beatson's *Naval and Military Memoirs*, ii. 93, 94.

ships of war of France, while her commerce was swept by innumerable privateers from every sea.

At the same time the foundations were laid of a new empire, destined at length, by much genius and much heroism, by many generations of skilful administration, and by not a few acts of atrocious perfidy and violence, to attain a magnitude and a splendour unequalled in the history of mankind. After the tragedy of the Black Hole, the complete expulsion of the English from Bengal, and the confiscation of all their factories, Surajah Dowlah retired triumphantly to Moorshedabad, leaving a deputy with a small force to protect Calcutta. But the English at Madras speedily took measures to restore their affairs. In December 1756 an English fleet under Admiral Watson, with an army of 900 Europeans and 1,500 sepoy under Clive, entered the Hooghly. On the 27th the English captured the fort between Fulta and Calcutta. On January 2, 1757, they reached, and after a short conflict occupied Calcutta. On the 10th they took and plundered the town of Hooghly, about twenty-three miles higher up the river; and on February 4 they attacked in its encampments an army of 40,000 men, with which Surajah Dowlah had marched against them. A thick mist interrupted the battle, but the Nabob was so impressed by the daring of the English that he made overtures for peace, which Clive, who knew that the French war had begun, and that he was needed at Madras, hastened to accept. The privileges of the Company were restored, and the English obtained some pecuniary compensation, as well as the right of fortifying Calcutta, and of founding a mint. Clive soon after turned his arms against the French settlement of Chandernagor, about twenty miles from Calcutta, which, in spite of the brave resistance of the French, and the threatening remonstrances of Surajah Dowlah, was compelled to surrender.

The war with the Nabob speedily broke out anew. Immediately after the treaty he had signed, he had summoned the French to assist him in expelling the English from Bengal. He had played false to all parties, vacillated and shuffled in all his engagements, and governed his people so atrociously that they were ripe for revolt; and Meer Jaffier, his chief general, resolved, with the assistance of the English, to dethrone him. A secret treaty was signed, and after a long series of intrigues and falsehoods, which it is not here necessary to describe, but which left deep stains on the principal people concerned,¹ the English unaided took the field, and on the 23rd of June, 1757, the fate of Bengal and ultimately of India was decided, with scarcely any loss on the English side, by the great battle of Plassy. Clive commanded only 900 Europeans² and 2,100 sepoys. The force of Surajah Dowlah was estimated at about 60,000 men. Meer Jaffier had just before renewed, with forms of peculiar solemnity, his allegiance to Surajah Dowlah, and had also promised Clive that he would desert to him in the battle, but he kept neither engagement, and remained passive, awaiting the event. But in spite of the immense disproportion of numbers, European discipline and European skill gained the day, and the army of Surajah Dowlah was scattered to the winds. Clive, wisely shutting his eyes to the timidity or treachery of Meer Jaffier, raised him to the position of Nabob of Bengal. Surajah Dowlah, soon after falling into the hands of the new sovereign, in the absence of the English, was put to death. Immense sums passed into the

¹ Except Admiral Watson, who refused to sign the fictitious treaty devised for the purpose of deceiving Omichund. The story is too well known from Macaulay's admirable essay on Clive to need

repetition.

² They consisted chiefly of the 39th Regiment. There were also about one hundred English artillerymen and fifty English sailors.

possession of the English Company, which from this time exercised a complete protectorate in Bengal.

The events of the next few years only served to confirm it. Clive, after the battle of Plassy, was made governor-general of the English possessions of Bengal, and the weakness of Meer Jaffier was so great that the English virtually exercised an absolute rule over a territory which already contained thirty millions of inhabitants. Repeated disturbances and partial insurrections against the new Nabob were composed or suppressed by the authority of Clive, and in 1759 he succeeded without a blow in defeating an aggression of a more formidable kind. The authority of the court of Delhi over the subordinate princes had long fallen into desuetude, and the reigning emperor was now held in complete servitude by his vizier; but his eldest son, Shah Alum, with a vigour not common in his race, fled to a Rohilla chief, who was in opposition to the vizier of his father, gathered around him an army of adventurers, and with the assistance of the Nabob of Oude, and of some other princes, endeavoured to re-establish the ascendancy of his family in Bengal by overthrowing the Nabob who had been raised to power by the English. A large army soon invested Patna. Meer Jaffier could scarcely be prevented by the influence of Clive from making the most abject submission, but the terror of the English name was already so great that the mere approach of an English army was sufficient to disperse the invaders. Meer Jaffier, in a transport of gratitude, gave a new dominion to Clive of the annual value of little less than 30,000*l.* Nearly at the same time Clive despatched a small army under Colonel Forde to drive the French from a region to the north of the Carnatic, which they had invaded, and which was defended by the Marquis de Conflans; and after some hard fighting the enterprise was fully achieved. At the close of 1759 another

danger arose, and was surmounted with equal success. The Dutch, who possessed some factories in Bengal, and who had so long rivalled the colonial power of England, watched with bitter jealousy the growing ascendancy of the English, and they resolved to counterbalance it by sending a considerable force from Java. Meer Jaffier, who had now come to look upon Clive with mingled terror and dislike, warmly, though secretly, encouraged them; and seven ships and 1,400 soldiers were sent from Java into the Hooghly. The troops were landed. The expedition was hastening to the Dutch settlement of Chinsurah, and there was reason to believe that Meer Jaffier was about to join it with forces that might gravely endanger the safety of the English. But the prompt daring of Clive baffled all calculations. Though England and Holland were at perfect peace, he ordered the Dutch to be attacked by sea and land. Their seven ships were taken. Their troops were cut to pieces. Their settlement in Bengal was attacked, and they were compelled to accept humiliating terms, rigidly restricting their future progress. Having thus secured his power against all competition, Clive sailed for Europe in February 1760.

While these events were taking place in Bengal, the struggle between the French and English for supremacy was decided in Madras. In the course of 1757 there had been several inconsiderable operations around Trichinopoly and Madura, but the great crisis of the war did not take place till after the arrival of Lally as commander-in-chief of the French, in April 1758. A member of an old Irish Jacobite family, the new commander had served from early youth in one of the Irish regiments in the French army, had borne an honourable part in several arduous campaigns, and had contributed largely to the French victory at Fontenoy. He was an eminently skilful officer, noted among brave men for his

heroic courage, frank, generous, ardent, and devoted, but easily led astray by a hot temper and an excessive self-confidence, rash and violent in his language, utterly ignorant of Oriental life and prejudices, and utterly destitute of the qualities of a good administrator. Argenson described him in a few graphic sentences as one who was like fire in his activity, who expressed, in terms that were not forgotten, everything that he felt, who could make no allowance for want of discipline, want of straightforwardness, or want of promptitude, and who rose into a storm of fury at the slightest appearance of negligence, insubordination, or fraud. The directors on appointing him urged upon him in the first place to eradicate the spirit of extreme corruption and cupidity that had become inveterate at Pondicherry, impoverishing the public, while it multiplied private fortunes; Lally arrived in the colony with a strong conviction that the chief persons in authority were dishonest, and he made little secret of his opinion. He had, indeed, every reason to be dissatisfied, and the negligence and abuses he discovered might have tried a more patient temper. Though he had been expected for eight months, he found that nothing whatever had been done to provide for his expedition. No money was raised to pay the soldiers. Twenty-four hours' provision for the men could not be obtained without difficulty in Pondicherry. The governor and council could give no accurate information about the number of the English troops, or even about the nature of the English fortifications. Time was very pressing, for Lally had started from France with more than 1,000 European soldiers, chiefly of his own Irish regiment, and though more than a fourth of them had perished by fever during the voyage, his army, if properly equipped, when united to the troops already in the colony, would have been much superior to any in the province.

He insisted at once on marching against Fort St. David. It was one of the most important, and perhaps the strongest fort possessed by the English in all Hindostan, and it was defended by a powerful garrison, and by 180 cannon. The difficulties of Lally were almost insuperable. His troops were weary and weakened by sickness and by a long journey. He found it difficult to feed, and impossible to pay them. The supply of mortars and bombs and draught cattle was miserably insufficient, and on May 24 the Governor of Pondicherry wrote that his resources were exhausted, and that the colony, wasted by fifteen years of nearly incessant war, was quite unable to support the army. Pressing letters were sent to France for supplies of money, but many months must elapse before an answer could be received. The French fleet which was destined to co-operate with Lally was attacked by the English, and though the battle was indecisive, it was too much injured to render much assistance. The necessity of hastening the works was imperative; and Lally, who was probably perfectly ignorant that he was outraging the most cherished religious convictions of the natives, ordered them without distinction of caste to be pressed and employed in carrying burdens and discharging other necessary works, and he thus turned all the sympathies of the natives against him. But the resolution of the general overcame all obstacles, and, on June 1, Fort St. David was compelled to surrender, and, in obedience to instructions received from France, was razed to the ground.

Lally desired to march at once upon Madras, but the commander of the French fleet refused to co-operate with him, and the want of money rendered another long enterprise utterly impossible. He accordingly turned his arms against the King of Tanjore, a rich native prince, against whom the French company held an old

claim for a considerable sum, and he hoped by subduing him to obtain money sufficient to carry on his operations. He sacked some villages, levied contributions, plundered a pagoda which was widely venerated, blew from his cannons six Brahmins, whom he believed to be spies, and at last reached and bombarded the capital; but he met with a more obstinate resistance than he expected, and his ammunition was so scanty that he was driven to fire back upon the enemy their own cannon-balls. He persevered until there were not more than twenty cartouches for every soldier in his army, and he then reluctantly gave the order to retreat. In the meantime the English fleet attacked and defeated that of the French; and the French admiral, in spite of the urgent remonstrances of Lally, refused to risk another encounter, and resolved to abandon the sea to the English and take refuge at Mauritius.

The position of Lally was now in the last degree deplorable. He had quarrelled with all the leading people about him. His army was without money or ammunition, and almost without provisions, and he was utterly ignorant of the country and of the very peculiar character of the people with whom he had to deal. He collected, however, with extreme difficulty some small munitions, took some inconsiderable forts, and at last even succeeded in carrying out his favourite project of attacking Madras. From his private fortune he contributed 60,000 rupees for the enterprise, and he induced some members of the council and a few other inhabitants of Pondicherry to follow his example. His army consisted of 2,700 Europeans and 4,000 natives, and he was ready to march in the beginning of November 1758, but furious storms of rain delayed him for a full month. The garrison of the town in the meantime was reinforced, and it now consisted of more than 1,700 European soldiers and about 2,400 natives. The Black

Town was easily taken, and some slight successes were gained against the garrison, but an insubordinate spirit was rapidly spreading among the French troops. Their pay was several months in arrear. The great quantities of spirits found in the Black Town contributed to demoralise them. Almost all provisions except rice and butter had come to an end. Desertions became very numerous, and many of the officers were in open or secret opposition to their general. A breach was made in the fort, and Lally was anxious for the assault, but his officers held back and pronounced it to be impracticable, and on February 16, 1759, Admiral Pococke, with powerful reinforcements from the English, appeared at Madras. Nothing then remained but retreat, and Lally fell back upon Pondicherry, where he found utter confusion and extreme destitution reigning, while his many enemies received him with insults, and every conference ended in angry recriminations. In September the French fleet from Mauritius again appeared off Pondicherry, having on its passage fought an indecisive but, on the whole, unsuccessful engagement with the English, and 500 European soldiers, 400 Caffirs, and a small quantity of money were landed; but the admiral refused to remain upon the coast, and again left the unhappy colony to its fate.

The interest of the war now gathered chiefly around the fort of Wandewash, one of the most important barriers of the French colony. In May an English force had attacked it, but on the approach of the French army it decamped. At the end of September Major Brereton made another attempt, but an officer named Geoghegan, who commanded a very inferior French force, repelled him with much loss. But on October 27, Colonel Coote, who was one of the ablest of the many able soldiers produced in the East Indian service, landed at Madras with considerable reinforcements, and

on November 29 he took Wandewash. Lally marched to oppose him, and a decisive battle was fought on December 22, 1759, in which the French were completely defeated.

By the battle of Wandewash Coote decided the fate of Madras, as Clive, by the battle of Plassy, had decided that of Bengal. The two battles were, indeed, in some respects, very different. At Plassy the skill and prowess of a small body of Europeans were opposed to an enormous numerical preponderance of Asiatics. At Wandewash the forces were probably nearly equal. Europeans bore the brunt of the fray, and each side was admirably commanded. Lally appears to have done what little could be done to retrieve affairs, but his army was demoralised and almost destitute, and he was detested by all the civil authorities with whom he had to combine. Fortress after fortress in the Carnatic was slowly reduced, and at last, on December 9, 1760, Coote laid siege to Pondicherry. It was gallantly defended, but provisions soon ran short, and on January 16, 1761, it was compelled to surrender at discretion, and the power of France in India was extinguished. The town which had so long rivalled the importance of Madras was levelled to the ground, and though the colony was restored and the town rebuilt at the peace, France never again became a serious rival of England in Hindostan. The scandalous inefficiency of the Government of Lewis XV. was in no respect more conspicuous than in the almost complete abandonment of these noble settlements, and in the gross ingratitude shown to those who had founded or defended them. La Bourdonnais had languished for years in the Bastille. Dupleix died a ruined and broken-hearted man. Lally, who had been guilty of much imprudence, but who had at least defended the interests of France with great courage, with perfect devotion, and with no mean mili-

tary skill, was reserved for a yet more terrible fate. While he was detained a prisoner of war in England, the indignation aroused in France by the ruin of Pondicherry blazed fierce and high, and his many enemies were only too glad to make him their scapegoat. With characteristic intrepidity and characteristic rashness he obtained his parole, and, relying on his innocence, appeared in Paris to meet his accusers. He was at once flung into the Bastille, removed from thence to a common prison, and confined for fifteen months before trial. He was then brought before the Parliament of Paris, one of the most partial of tribunals, denied the assistance of counsel, and condemned to death on the vague charge of having betrayed the interests of the King. When the sentence was read to him, he exclaimed, in the bitterness of his indignation, 'Is this then the reward of forty-five years of service?' He tried to stab himself to the heart with a pair of compasses that was lying near, but the instrument was wrested from his hand, and that very day he was dragged to the scaffold on a common dung-cart, and with a gag to his mouth. It was not until 1778 that the unrighteous sentence was reversed, and the memory of one of the bravest though most unfortunate of soldiers judicially vindicated.¹

The administration of Pitt had little or nothing to say to the victories of Clive, but it contributed much by its prompt reinforcements, and by the expeditions which detained the French troops in their own country, to the triumph of Coote in Madras. On the other hand, the rumours of great victories in a distant and almost un-

¹ See *Mém. de Lally*. Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*. Voltaire, *Mélanges Historiques*, *Lally*, and the *Hists.* of Orme and of Mill. *Biographie Uni-*

verselle, art. 'Lally.' Coote said that no other man in all India could have maintained the struggle so long or so gallantly.

known land inflamed the imaginations and strengthened the enthusiasm of the nation. At the close of 1758 there were no less than 24,000 French prisoners captive in England, an army of nearly 95,000 British and 7,000 foreign troops had been voted, and above twelve millions had been raised for the ensuing year.¹ Yet there were no signs of flagging or discontent. The intoxication of glory had made the nation indifferent to sacrifice, and the spell which the great minister had thrown over his fellow-countrymen was unbroken. It was noticed that, unlike all previous statesmen, he seemed to take a strange pleasure in rather exaggerating than attenuating the pecuniary sacrifices he demanded, and his eloquence and his personal ascendancy almost silenced opposition. Even the Prussian subsidy was acquiesced in with scarcely a murmur. Pitt defended it in a speech of consummate power; and as the sound of approbation arose from every part of the House, he shouted, in his loudest and most defiant tone, 'Is there an Austrian among you? Let him stand forth and reveal himself!' and this, which from any other speaker would have seemed the most arrogant of rants, had a thrilling effect upon his hearers. Very judiciously, however, he left to others the burden and the odium of financial measures and of parliamentary management, and identified himself only with those military enterprises which he understood so well. 'Ignorant of the whole circle of finance,' wrote an acute observer, 'he kept aloof from all details, drew magnificent plans, and left others to find the magnificent means. Disdaining to descend into the operations of an office which he did not fill, he affected to throw on the Treasury the execution of measures which he dictated. . . . Secluded from all eyes, his orders were

¹ Walpole's *George II.* iii. 151.

received as oracles. Their success was imputed to his inspiration—misfortunes and miscarriages fell to the account of the more human agents.’¹

The German war was naturally the least popular part of the policy of the Government. It cost much both in men and money. It involved the greatest dangers and it promised least advantage to England. Pitt, in opposition, had done everything in his power to fan the popular feeling against continental subsidies, and it is one of the most remarkable proofs of the ascendancy he exercised that he was able to extend that system further than even Carteret had desired. He urged, in a sentence which was often repeated, that he conquered America in Germany, and the career of Frederick exercised a very natural fascination over the popular mind. One of the most marked features of the national character is the strong sympathy which is always shown in England for a small Power struggling against great odds; a sympathy honourable and noble in itself, but which is often carried to such a point that it makes the British public wholly indifferent to the original cause of the conflict. Never in the history of Europe was the spectacle of such a struggle more strikingly exhibited than by Frederick at this time. In the campaign of 1759 it seemed as if everything was lost. The veteran troops with which Frederick had begun the war were now for the most part swept away and replaced by raw levies. The Austrians, under Daun, were again slowly but steadily creeping on upon Saxony, while a great Russian army menaced Silesia. Marshal Dohna, who was sent at the head of a Prussian army to repel it, found himself out-manœuvred and compelled to retire. Frederick superseded him, and replaced him by General Wedell, to whom he gave

¹ Walpole's *George II.* iii. 173, 174.

positive orders to attack the Russians. The Prussians were less than 30,000. The Russians were about 70,000. A battle was fought at Züllichau on July 23, and the Prussians were completely defeated, and Frankfort-on-Oder fell into the Russian hands. Frederick then hastened in person, with every soldier he could spare, to oppose the Russians. Daun, as usual, had entrenched himself impreguably, and knowing that the Russian army was deficient in cavalry, he sent 12,000 horsemen with 8,000 foot, under the command of General Laudohn, to reinforce it. On August 12 in the neighbourhood of Frankfort the great battle of Kunersdorf was fought. Frederick commanded 50,000 men; the Russian army was estimated at between 80,000 and 90,000. At first fortune appeared to smile on the King, but at the end he experienced the most crushing of all his defeats. 19,000 Prussians were killed, wounded, or made prisoners. All their cannon were taken; most of their generals were killed or wounded. Frederick escaped only with great difficulty, and at the evening of the day not more than 3,000 Prussian troops were together. Had it not been for the amazing dilatoriness of the enemy, who were content with the blood they had shed, and who left Frederick time to collect the scattered remnants of his army, to bring cannon from different fortresses, and to refill his ranks by new levies, it would have been impossible to continue the war. As it was, Saxony was for a time almost denuded of Prussian troops. In the beginning of September, Dresden was taken by the Austrians, and in November, before the armies retired into winter quarters, Marshal Daun compelled several thousand men, under the Prussian General Finck, to surrender themselves as prisoners at Maxen, while a few days later another Austrian general captured General Dierecke, with 1,500 Prussians, at Meissen.

But even in this year, so disastrous to Frederick, the star of England shone proudly on the Continent. Prince Ferdinand had, it is true, in the middle of April, been defeated by the French at Bergen. But a far more important battle was fought at Minden, on August 1, when a French army of more than 50,000 men was utterly defeated, with a loss of at least 7,000 men and of 30 cannon, by a British and German army of about 36,000 men. One shadow, indeed, rested on the fortunes of the day. Lord George Sackville, who commanded the English cavalry, through a nervousness of which there are very few examples in English military history, disobeyed at a critical moment of the battle the order to charge, and thus saved the French from absolute destruction. He was pronounced by a court-martial guilty of disobedience, and unfit to serve the Crown in any military capacity whatever; and although great family influence and very considerable abilities raised him in the following reign to a high position, his reputation was irrevocably blasted. But the timidity of one man was amply redeemed by the splendid courage shown by many thousands, and the victory of Minden contributed largely to reconcile the people to the continental war. The French still meditated an invasion of England, but all alarm from this quarter was dispelled in November, when Hawke defeated and nearly annihilated the French fleet in Quiberon Bay.

Still, this war, had it not been accompanied by splendid victories on sea, in Asia, and in America, and had it not been conducted by a statesman to whom the nation could refuse nothing, would have met with great and general opposition at home. In 1760—the last year of the reign of George II.—the campaign opened very fatally for Frederick. He had, indeed, made the most extraordinary efforts to restore his affairs. The

fields were almost deserted, civil business was almost in suspense through the unsparing levies which he had raised for his army. Prisoners of war were compelled, at the point of the bayonet, to take the oath of allegiance and enlist against their countrymen, and every device was employed to attract or inveigle soldiers from the surrounding States. The English subsidy contributed in part to defray the expenses of the war, and by pitiless exactions immense sums were drawn from the inhabitants of those unhappy provinces which had the misfortune to be occupied by Prussian troops. Saxon woods were cut down and sold to speculators. The civil officials were left unpaid, while a vast quantity of base money was coined, and issued from the Prussian Mint. In this manner, by imposing sacrifices such as no nation could undergo, except for self-preservation, Frederick endeavoured to meet the enormous preponderance of power that was against him, while the spirits of an ignorant and superstitious soldiery were raised by the circulation of false news and of forged prophecies.

But for a time all seemed in vain. The campaign of 1759 had extended far into the winter, and Frederick conceived the bold idea of renewing it while the vigilance of his enemies was relaxed in winter quarters, and of making another effort to drive the Austrians from Saxony. His head-quarters were at Freyberg. Having received reinforcements from Prince Ferdinand, and been joined by 12,000 men under the hereditary prince, he left the latter to keep guard behind the Mülde, and in January 1760, at a time when the snow lay deep upon the ground, he made a fierce spring upon the Austrians, who were posted at Dippoldiswalde; but General Maguire, who commanded there, baffled him by the vigilance and skill with which he guarded every pass, and compelled him to retrace his steps to Frey-

berg. When the winter had passed and the regular campaign had opened, Laudohn, one of the most active of the Austrian generals—the same who had borne a great part in the victories of Hochkirchen and Kunersdorf—entered Silesia, surprised with a greatly superior force the Prussian General Fouqué, compelled him, with some thousands of soldiers, to surrender, and a few days later reduced the important fortress of Glatz. Frederick, at the first news of the danger of Fouqué, marched rapidly towards Silesia, Daun slowly following, while an Austrian corps, under General Lacy, impeded his march by incessant skirmishes. On learning the surrender of Fouqué, Frederick at once turned and hastened towards Dresden. It was July, and the heat was so intense that on a single day more than a hundred of his soldiers dropped dead upon the march. He hoped to gain some days upon Daun, who was still pursuing, and to become master of Dresden before succours arrived. As he expected, he soon outstripped the Austrian general, and the materials for the siege were collected with astonishing rapidity; but General Maguire, who commanded at Dresden, defended it with complete success till the approach of the Austrian army obliged Frederick to retire. Baffled in his design, he took a characteristic vengeance by bombarding that beautiful city with red-hot balls, slaughtering multitudes of its peaceful inhabitants, and reducing whole quarters to ashes; and he then darted again upon Silesia, still followed by the Austrian general. Laudohn had just met with his first reverse, having failed in the siege of Breslau; on August 15, when Daun was still far off, Frederick fell upon him and beat him in the battle of Liegnitz. Soon after, however, this success was counterbalanced by Lacy and Tottleben, who, at the head of some Austrians and Russians, had marched upon Berlin, which, after a brave resistance, was once more captured

and ruthlessly plundered ; but on the approach of Frederick the enemy speedily retreated. Frederick then turned again towards Saxony, which was again occupied by Daun, and on November 3 he attacked his old enemy in his strong entrenchments at Torgau. Daun, in addition to the advantage of position, had the advantage of great numerical superiority, for his army was reckoned at 65,000, while that of Frederick was not more than 44,000. But the generalship of Frederick gained the victory. General Ziethen succeeded in attacking the Austrians in the rear, gaining the height, and throwing them into confusion. Daun was wounded and disabled, and General O'Donnell, who was next in command, was unable to restore the Austrian line. The day was conspicuous for its carnage even among the bloody battles of the Seven Years' War : 20,000 Austrians were killed, wounded, or prisoners, while 14,000 Prussians were left on the field. The battle closed the campaign for the year, leaving all Saxony in the possession of the Prussians, with the exception of Dresden, which was still held by Maguire.

The English and German army, under Prince Ferdinand, succeeded in the meantime in keeping at bay a very superior French army, under Marshal Broglie ; and several slight skirmishes took place, with various results. The battle of Warburg, which was the most important, was won chiefly by the British cavalry, but Prince Ferdinand failed in his attempts to take Wesel and Gottingen ; and at the close of the year the French took up their quarters at Cassel.¹

Such is a brief outline of the events of the war to the close of 1760. The principal criticisms that have been brought against the war ministry of Pitt were the

¹ I have compiled this sketch chiefly from the works of Frede-

rick and from the inimitable narrative of Mr. Carlyle.

expense that was incurred, and the uselessness of some of his expeditions. The latter criticism has been already discussed; the former, it must be admitted, had some plausibility. Notwithstanding the long peace, and the strict economy of Walpole, the National Debt, which was fifty-two millions at the accession of George II. in 1727, had risen to nearly one hundred and thirty-nine millions at the peace of 1763. Fox accused Pitt of breaking windows with guineas; and Lord Bath, in a powerful pamphlet, complained that the war expenses during all King William's reign 'were at a medium not above three and a half millions a year, and Queen Anne's, though the last years were exorbitant, were little more than five millions; whereas now twelve or fourteen millions are demanded without reserve, and, what is still more, voted without opposition.'¹ In 1760, no less than sixteen millions were voted.² It may, however, be truly answered that the expenditure of Pitt was insignificant when compared with that of North in the American war, and of his own son in the French war; that the area of hostilities had been immensely increased by the development of the rival colonies in America and India; that the scale of the German war was such that no smaller subsidy would have enabled Frederick to hold his own, while no subsidy was ever more adequately employed; and, lastly, that the expeditions of Pitt were almost always crowned with success. He maintained with much reason that prompt expenditure is good economy in war, and the expeditions he sent forth were so admirably equipped that their blows were usually decisive, and had rarely to be repeated. Besides this, one of the main objects of the war was the creation of a great colonial empire, which, at a time

¹ *Letter to Two Great Men*, p. 33.

² Walpole's *George II.* iii. 282.

when free trade was yet unknown, was the essential condition of great commercial development. The immense outlets furnished for English industry, and the complete empire which England soon acquired upon the sea, rapidly increased the national wealth. France, in 1759, proclaimed herself bankrupt, and stopped the payment for her debts ; the Prussian people were reduced to the lowest depths of misery, and their Government subsisted only by debasing the coin ; but in England the chief springs of national wealth were unimpaired, and in no previous war had commercial activity been so fully sustained. It is a remarkable proof of the healthy financial condition of England that, in nearly every war, her exports, though they for a time declined in value, soon ascended again, till they reached and passed, in time of war, the level of the preceding peace. In the war which began in 1702, this was effected in ten years ; in the war which began in 1739, it was effected in nine years ; in the war which began in 1755, the period was much shorter, and already, in 1758, the exports passed the figure of the preceding peace.¹

A more just, and at the same time a more serious criticism, is that the war, in its later stages, had become unnecessary. If Pitt seriously desired peace with France, it seems almost certain that he could have obtained it ; and even if Europe could not have been pacified, the withdrawal from either side of France and England, without seriously disturbing the balance of power, would have greatly limited the contest. But although some slight negotiations were made in 1759, it appears evident that Pitt had no real desire for peace, or at least for any peace that did not involve the complete humiliation of his adversary. Not content with having almost annihilated the fleets of France, he desired

¹ Burke's *Third Letter on a Regicide Peace*.

to deprive her of all her colonial empire, and also of all participation in that Newfoundland fishery which he described as the great nursery of her sailors. 'Some time ago,' he said in the midst of his triumphs, 'I would have been content to bring France to her knees, now I will not rest till I have laid her on her back.' He once confessed, with a startling frankness, that he loved 'honourable war.' He never appears to have had any adequate sense of the misery it produces, or to have looked upon France in any other light than that of an inevitable and natural enemy. It must be remembered, however, that while the contest between the Prussians on the one side and the Austrians and Russians on the other, was one of the most stubborn and most sanguinary on record, England had in this war the good fortune of gaining immense advantages by victories that were almost bloodless. Never, perhaps, since the struggle at Thermopylæ were the military enterprises so disproportioned to the political results they produced. Pitt declared in Parliament that not 1,500 Englishmen had fallen in the conquest of Canada.¹ In the battle of Plassy, which decided the ascendancy of England in Bengal, Clive lost only 20 Europeans and 52 sepoy.² In the battle of Wandewash, which overthrew the French power in India and made England supreme in Madras, the losses of Coote in killed and wounded were 190 Europeans and 69 black soldiers.³

It must be added, too, that the memory of two inglorious peaces rankled bitterly in the mind of the people, and that in desiring to push the war to the uttermost, Pitt was in perfect accordance with their wishes. For the first time since the great days of Queen

¹ Horace Walpole's *George II.*
iii. 235.

tions of the British in Hindostan,
ii. 178.

² Orme's *Military Transac-*

³ *Ibid.* ii. 589.

Anne, the nation was drinking the intoxicating cup of military glory, and Marlborough himself was never supported by an enthusiasm as powerful and as undivided as that which was elicited by the triumphs of Pitt. Marlborough was personally never very popular. A large party in England regarded every victory he won as injurious to their policy and their interests. He was fighting chiefly for continental objects, and though the splendour of his genius threw a flood of glory upon the nation to which he belonged, English soldiers bore but a small part in the battles which he won. Of the 52,000 men who conquered at Blenheim 18,000 were imperial troops under Eugene. Of the remainder who were commanded by Marlborough about a fourth part were English.¹ At Ramillies the chief brunt of the battle was borne by the Dutch and the Danes, who encountered and with little assistance cut to pieces the household troops who were the very flower of the army of France.² At Oudenarde the Confederates lost in killed and wounded 2,972 men. Less than 180 of these were English.³ Of the 129 battalions who formed the victorious army at Malplaquet only 19 were English, and the English suffered little more than a tenth part of the whole losses of the allies.⁴ But no other European nation took part in the conquests of Canada and India or in the naval victories of Hawke, and the fruits of these triumphs belonged to England alone.

¹ Marlborough's wing consisted of 48 battalions and 86 squadrons. Of these 14 battalions and 13 squadrons were English.—Lediard's *Life of Marlborough*, i. 368.

² Ibid. ii. 26, 27.

³ Ibid. ii. 284.

⁴ 1,866 men out of 18,353. Ibid. ii. 501. The Dutch, who

are hardly mentioned in most English accounts of these battles, lost 8,463 men at Malplaquet, more than 1,500 men at Oudenarde, and most of those who fell at Ramillies. I may mention that Lediard's military statistics are much fuller than those of Coxe.

Party spirit had wholly gone down. The King was now reconciled to his great minister. Parliament was almost unanimous, and for the first time for many years it was in real sympathy with the people.

Pitt made large demands upon the self-sacrifice and resolution of the nation, but in this respect he was never disappointed. England under his guidance was almost wholly unlike the England of Walpole and Pelham. Its relaxed energies were braced anew. The thick crust of selfishness, corruption, and effeminacy was broken, and an emulation of heroism and enterprise was displayed. Foreign nations cordially recognised the greatness of the change. 'England,' said Frederick, 'had long been in labour, but had at last produced a man;' and long years after Pitt had been removed from office, it was observed that the mere mention of the probability of his returning to power was sufficient to quell the boasts of the French. At the same time he never appears to have been regarded in France with the intensity of hatred which was bestowed upon his son. The magnanimous and generous features of his character, and the somewhat theatrical nature of his greatness in some degree dazzled even his enemies; and it is remarkable that one of the most eloquent eulogies of Chatham is from a Frenchman, the Abbé Raynal.

The intellectual and moral qualities that constitute a great war minister and a great home minister are so very different that they have hardly ever been united in the same man. In judging the influence of Pitt on home politics we must remember how short a time he was in power and in health. During the last years of George II., when his authority was so great, the energies of the nation were absorbed in the war; nor did he ever attain in home politics the authority which was willingly conceded him in military administration.

In the succeeding reign he was either in opposition, or, being in office, was prostrated by illness. His proposals were seldom or never carried into effect, or even fully elaborated. They were like the unfinished sketches of a great artist, or like beacon-lights kindled in the darkness to mark out a path for his successors. That he possessed the qualities of a great home or peace minister can hardly be alleged. In matters of finance and on questions of commercial policy he was extremely ignorant. We look in vain in his career for any great signs of administrative or constructive talent, and he was eminently deficient in the tact, the moderation, and the temper that are requisite for party management. Yet even in this sphere he exercised a profound and, on the whole, a salutary influence. The most remarkable characteristic of his home policy was the great prominence he gave to the moral side of legislation, or, in other words, the skill with which he acted upon the higher enthusiasms of the people. In his conception of politics, the supreme end of legislation is to inspire the nation with a lofty spirit of patriotism, courage, and enterprise; to enlist its nobler qualities habitually in the national service, and to make the Legislature a faithful reflex of its sentiments. No preceding statesman showed so full a confidence in the people. It was thus that, adopting a suggestion of Argyle,¹ he armed the Jacobite clans, and attracted to national channels the martial enthusiasm of Scotland, which had been so long in the service of the Stuarts. It was thus that he proposed, and at last carried out, the scheme of a national militia, and but for the opposition of his colleagues, he would have extended it to Scotland. It was thus that he supported, though without success, the measure which

¹ See Ramsay's *Scotland and Scotchmen of the Eighteenth Century*, ii. 504, 505, 513, 514.

was brought forward by Pratt in 1758 to extend the operation of the Habeas Corpus Act, which applied only to those who were detained on some criminal charge, to all who were confined under any pretence whatever. In the following reign he was the first conspicuous statesman who raised the banner of parliamentary reform, and it was characteristic of him that he based his proposal, not on the common ground of the irregularities or anomalies of the Legislature, but on the ground that the strong patriotic spirit that animated the country was not adequately represented in it; that corrupt or personal motives had lowered its tone, and that an infusion of the popular element was necessary to reinvigorate it.

It was in the same spirit that he attempted in his latter days to break down the system of party government, under the belief that it diverted the energies of politicians from national objects; and to withdraw the government of India from the East India Company, under the belief that so grèat a territory should not remain in the hands of a mercantile company, or be governed on merely commercial principles, but should be thoroughly incorporated in the British Empire. No one who follows his career can doubt that, had he been in power at the time of the American troubles, he could have conciliated the colonies; and it was during the later ministry of Pitt that the first steps were taken towards the introduction of a better government into Ireland. He never could have conducted party government with the tact of Walpole; he never could have framed, like Burke, a great measure of economical reform, or have presided, like Peel, over a great revolution of the commercial system; but no minister had a greater power of making a sluggish people brave, or a slavish people free, or a discontented people loyal.

Although he cannot be said to have carried a single definite measure increasing the power of the people, or diminishing the corrupt influence of the Crown or of the aristocracy, it may be asserted, without a paradox, that he did more for the popular cause than any statesman since the generation that effected the Revolution. With very little parliamentary connection, and with no favour from royalty, he became, by the force of his abilities, and by the unbounded popularity which he enjoyed, the foremost man of the nation. In him the people for the first time felt their power. He was essentially their representative, and he gloried in avowing it. He declared, even before the Privy Council, that he had been called to office by the voice of the people, and that he considered himself accountable to them alone. The great towns, and especially London, constantly and warmly supported him; and though his popularity was sometimes for a short time eclipsed, it was incomparably greater than that of any previous statesman. In our days, such popularity, united with such abilities, would have enabled a statesman to defy all opposition. In the days of Pitt it was not so, and he soon found himself incapable of conducting government without the assistance of the borough patronage of the aristocracy, or of resisting the hostility of the Crown. But although he was not omnipotent in politics, the voice of the people at least made him so powerful that no Government was stable when he opposed it, and that all parties sought to win him to their side. This was a new fact in parliamentary history, and it marks a great step in the progress of democracy.

His influence was also very great in raising the moral tone of public life. His transparent and somewhat ostentatious purity formed a striking contrast to the prevailing spirit of English politics, and the

power and persistence with which he appealed on every occasion to the higher and unselfish motives infused a new moral energy into the nation. The political materialism of the school of Walpole perished under his influence, and his career was an important element in a great change which was passing over England. Under the influence of many adverse causes the standard of morals had been greatly depressed since the Restoration; and in the early Hanoverian period the nation had sunk into a condition of moral apathy rarely paralleled in its history. But from about the middle of the eighteenth century a reforming spirit was once more abroad, and a steady movement of moral ascent may be detected. The influence of Pitt in politics, and the influence of Wesley and his followers in religion, were the earliest and most important agencies in effecting it. It was assisted in another department by the example of George III., who introduced an improved tone into fashionable life, and it was reflected in the smaller sphere of public amusements in the Shakespearian revival of Garrick. In most respects Pitt and Wesley were, it is true, extremely unlike. The animating principles of the latter are to be found in doctrines that are most distinctively Christian, and especially in that aspect of Christian teaching which is most fitted to humble men. Pitt was a man of pure morals, unchallenged orthodoxy, and of a certain lofty piety,¹ but yet his character was essentially of the Roman type, in which patriotism and magnanimity and well-directed pride are the first of virtues; and the sentences of the Latin poets and the examples of the age of the Scipios, which, in a letter to a bishop, he once called ‘the apostolic age of patriotism,’

¹ See especially a striking letter about religion to his nephew.—*Chatham Correspondence*, i. 73-75.

appear to have left the deepest impression on his mind. But with all these differences there was a real analogy and an intimate relation between the work of these two men. The religious and political notions prevailing in the early Hanoverian period were closely connected. The theological conception which looked upon religion as a kind of adjunct to the police force, which dwelt almost exclusively on the prudence of embracing it and on the advantages it could confer, and which regarded all spirituality and all strong emotions as fanaticism, corresponded very faithfully to that political system under which corruption was regarded as the natural instrument, and the maintenance of material interests as the supreme end of government; while the higher motives of political action were systematically ridiculed and discouraged. By Wesley in the sphere of religion, by Pitt in the sphere of politics, the tone of thought and feeling was changed, and this is perhaps the aspect of the career of Pitt which possesses the most abiding interest and importance. The standard of political honour was perceptibly raised. It was felt that enthusiasm, disinterestedness, and self-sacrifice had their place in politics; and although there was afterwards, for short periods, extreme corruption, public opinion never acquiesced in it again.

It was a singular fortune that produced, in so brief a period from the ranks of the Whig party, one of the greatest peace ministers and the greatest war minister of England, and it would be difficult to find two nearly contemporary statesmen, of the same party and of equal eminence, who in character and policy were more directly opposed than Walpole and Pitt. Each was in many respects immeasurably superior to the other, and in some respects they will hardly admit of comparison. We can scarcely, for example, compare a speaker who was simply a clear, shrewd, and forcible debater, with-

out polish of manner or elevation of language, with an orator who surpassed Chesterfield in grace, while he equalled Demosthenes in power. In his private life, Walpole, though a man of great kindness of nature, was notoriously lax and immoral, while Pitt was without reproach ; but we must remember that the first was full of constitutional vigour, while the second was a confirmed invalid. In public integrity there was, I think, less real difference between them than is usually imagined. There is no proof that Walpole ever dishonestly appropriated public money. Both statesmen received large rewards for their services, and these rewards in kind and in amount were nearly the same. The factious conduct of Walpole during the administration of Stanhope may be fairly balanced by the conduct of Pitt towards Walpole, and afterwards towards Newcastle. Pitt, however, was entirely free from nepotism, while Walpole bestowed vast public revenues upon his sons. Walpole hated everything theatrical and declamatory. He had too little dignity for the position he occupied, and in his best days he was more liked than respected. Pitt was always in some degree an actor. His want of social freedom greatly impaired his success as a party leader, and he inspired more awe than any other English politician. The ability of the one was shown chiefly in averting, that of the other in meeting, danger. A cautious wisdom predominated in the first, an enterprising greatness in the second. The first dealt almost exclusively with material interests, and sought only to allay strong passions. The second delighted in evoking, appealing to, and directing the most fiery enthusiasms. The first was incomparably superior in his knowledge of finance ; the second in his management of war. The first loved peace, and made England very prosperous ; the second loved war, and surrounded his country with glory.

The influence of the two men on political morals was, as we have seen, directly opposite. With much quiet patriotism Walpole had none of the loftiness of character of Pitt, and was entirely incapable of the traits of splendid magnanimity and disinterestedness which were so conspicuous in the latter. Though he did not originate, he accepted, systematised, and extended parliamentary corruption; his personal integrity, though probably very real, was never above suspicion, and his ridicule of all who professed high political principles contributed very much to lower the prevailing tone. It was reserved for Pitt to break the spell of corruption, and he did more than any other English statesman to ennoble public life and to raise the character of public men.

The death of George II., on October 25, 1760, cut short the ministerial ascendancy of Pitt as well as the undisputed supremacy of the Whig party. Without being in any sense of the word a great, or in any high sense of the word a good man, this sovereign deserves, I think, at least in his public capacity, more respect than he has received, and England owes much to his government. He was, it is true, narrow, ignorant, ill-tempered, avaricious, and somewhat vain, exceedingly faulty in his domestic relations, and entirely destitute of all taste for literature, science, or art; but he was also an eminently honest, truthful, and honourable man; and during a period of thirty-three years, and often under circumstances of strong temptation, he discharged with remarkable fidelity the duties of a constitutional monarch. He was unfaithful to his marriage-bed, but he had a sincere respect and admiration for his wife; and, to the great advantage of the country, he allowed himself to be governed mainly by her superior intellect. He was extremely fond of war, and showed distinguished personal courage at Oudenarde and at Dettingen; but he cordially recognised the ability of the most pacific

minister of the age, and he supported Walpole with honourable constancy through all the vicissitudes of his career. He loved money greatly, but he lived strictly within the revenues that were assigned to him, and was the most economical English sovereign since Elizabeth. He was a despotic sovereign in Germany, as well as a constitutional sovereign in England; but the habits he had formed in the first capacity never induced him to trench in the smallest degree upon the liberties of England, and on several occasions he sacrificed frankly his strongest preferences and antipathies. It was thus that he allowed Walpole to restrain him from the war which he desired; that he received Newcastle as minister; that he discarded Carteret, who, of all politicians, was most pleasing to him; that he consented, though only after a long struggle, to give his confidence to Pitt, who had grossly insulted him. He yielded, ungracefully and ungraciously indeed, and usually with an explosion of violent language, but yet honestly and frankly; and no minister to whom he had ever given his confidence had cause to complain of him. ‘The late good old King,’ said Chatham in the succeeding reign, ‘had something of humanity, and amongst many other royal virtues he possessed justice, truth, and sincerity in an eminent degree, so that he had something about him by which it was possible to know whether he liked you or disliked you.’ He was a respectable military administrator and an industrious man of business, and some of the sayings recorded of him exhibit considerable shrewdness and point. Courtly divines and poets were accustomed to eulogise him in language which would be exaggerated if applied to the genius of Napoleon or to the virtues of Marcus Aurelius. An impartial historian will acknowledge that the reign of George II. was in its early part one of the most prosperous and tranquil, and in its latter part one of the most glorious periods of

English history; and that the moderation with which the sovereign exercised his prerogative, and the fidelity with which he sacrificed his own wishes in the support of his ministers, contributed in no small measure to the result.

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON



STANDARD HISTORICAL WORKS.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) HISTORY of ENGLAND, from the ACCESSION of JAMES the SECOND.

Popular Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 5s. | People's Edition, 4 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.
Student's Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12s. | Cabinet Edition, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s.
Library Edition, 5 vols. 8vo. £4.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) ESSAYS.

Student's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s. | Trevelyan Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 9s.
People's Edition, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8s. | Cabinet Edition, 4 vols. 8vo. 24s.
Library Edition, 3 vols. 8vo. 36s.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) ESSAYS, with LAYS of ANCIENT ROME. In 1 volume.

Popular Edition, crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.
Authorised Edition, crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.; or 3s. 6d. gilt edges.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS.

People's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. | Library Edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS and SPEECHES.

Popular Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. | Student's Edition, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6s.
Cabinet Edition, including Indian Penal Code, Lays of Ancient Rome, and Miscellaneous Poems, 4 vols. post 8vo. 24s.

MACAULAY'S (Lord) COMPLETE WORKS.

Cabinet Edition, 16 vols. post 8vo. £4. 16s. | Library Edition, 8 vols. demy 8vo. £5. 5s.

HISTORY of ENGLAND from the FALL of WOLSEY to the DEFEAT of the SPANISH ARMADA. By JAMES A. FROUDE. 12 vols. crown 8vo. £2. 2s.

The ENGLISH in IRELAND in the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By JAMES A. FROUDE. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.

SHORT STUDIES on GREAT SUBJECTS. By JAMES A. FROUDE. Cabinet Edition, 4 vols. crown 8vo. 24s. Popular Edition, 4 vols. crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.

HISTORY of ENGLAND from the ACCESSION of JAMES I. to the OUTBREAK of the GREAT CIVIL WAR. By S. R. GARDINER. 10 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.

HISTORY of the GREAT CIVIL WAR, 1642-1649. By SAMUEL R. GARDINER, LL.D. &c. (3 vols.) Vol. I. 1642-1644. With 24 Maps (out of print). Vol. II. 1644-1647. With 21 Maps, 8vo. 24s. Vol. III. 1647-1649. With 8 Maps, 8vo. 28s.

HISTORY of ENGLAND in the EIGHTEENTH CEN- TURY. By W. E. H. LECKY. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 1700-1760, 36s. Vols. III. and IV. 1760-1784, 36s. Vols. V. and VI. 1784-1793, 36s. Vols. VII. and VIII. 1793-1800, 36s. Cabinet Edition. ENGLAND, 7 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each. IRELAND, 5 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

STANDARD HISTORICAL WORKS.

- The **CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY** of ENGLAND since the ACCESSION of GEORGE III. 1760-1870. By Sir T. ERSKINE MAY (Lord FARNBOROUGH). 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18s.
- HISTORY** of ENGLAND from the CONCLUSION of the GREAT WAR in 1815 to the YEAR 1858. By SPENCER WALPOLE.
LIBRARY EDITION. 5 vols. 8vo. £4. 10s.
CABINET EDITION. 6 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.
- A **JOURNAL** of the REIGNS of KING GEORGE IV, KING WILLIAM IV. and QUEEN VICTORIA. By the late CHARLES C. F. GREVILLE, Esq. 8 vols. crown 8vo. 6s. each.
- A **HISTORY** of TAXATION and TAXES in ENGLAND. from the EARLIEST TIMES to the PRESENT DAY. By STEPHEN DOWELL, Assistant Solicitor of Inland Revenue. 4 vols. 8vo. 48s.
- The **ENGLISH CHURCH** in the EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By CHARLES J. ARBEY and JOHN H. OVERTON. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- HISTORY** of the PAPACY during the REFORMATION. By MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D. LL.D. Bishop of Peterborough. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 1378-1464, 32s. Vols. III. and IV. 1464-1518, 24s.
- The **HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY** of EUROPE. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN. With 65 Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. 31s. 6d.
- HISTORY** of the ROMANS under the EMPIRE. By DEAN MERIVALE. Cabinet Edition, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48s. Cheap Edition, 8 vols. crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. each.
- A **HISTORY** of the FRENCH REVOLUTION. By H. MORSE STEPHENS, Balliol College, Oxford. 3 vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 18s. each.
- HISTORY** of CIVILISATION in ENGLAND and FRANCE, SPAIN and SCOTLAND. By H. T. BUCKLE. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 24s.
- The **HISTORY** of EUROPEAN MORALS from AUGUSTUS to CHARLEMAGNE. By W. E. H. LECKY. 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 16s.
- HISTORY** of the RISE and INFLUENCE of the SPIRIT of RATIONALISM in EUROPE. By W. E. H. LECKY. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.
- DEMOCRACY** in AMERICA. By A. DE TOCQUEVILLE. Translated by H. REEVE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16s.
- The **HISTORY** of PHILOSOPHY, from Thales to Comte. By G. H. LEWES. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.
- The **HISTORY** of ISRAEL. By Professor HEINRICH EWALD. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 24s. Vols. III. and IV. 21s. Vol. V. 18s. Vol. VI. 16s. Vol. VII. 21s. Vol. VIII. 18s.

~~~~~  
London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.



DA  
480  
L4  
1892  
V. 2

THE LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE  
STAMPED BELOW.



SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

**See Spine for  
Barcode Number**

